

THE  
MUDRĀRĀKSASANĀṬAKAKATHĀ  
OF  
MAHĀDEVA

EDITED  
WITH INTRODUCTION NOTES

BY  
DR. V RAGHAVAN, M.A., PH.D.,  
*Department of Sanskrit University of Madras*  
Author of

"Bhoja s Śṛṅgara Prakāśa" "The Number of Rasas  
Some Concepts of Alaṅkāra Śāstra" etc.

WITH A FOREWORD

BY  
M ANANTANARAYANAN M.A., I.C.S.,  
*District Judge, Tanjore*

President Administrative Committee MSSM Library Tanjore  
Published by the Srinivasa Press, Tiruvadi  
for the Administrative Committee of the  
Maharajah Serfoji's Saraswati Mahal Library Tanjore.

TO  
THE FOUNDERS  
AND  
THE PROMOTERS  
OF THE  
SARASWATI MAHAL,  
TANJORE

## FOREWORD

The publication of this work, the *Mudrā-rākṣasanāṭakakathā* of Mahādeva, marks the first step of a planned attempt by the Administrative Committee of the Saraswati Mahal Library, Tanjore, to bring out some at least of the rare works, in Samskrit and Tamil, to be found in the archives of the Library, after careful and scholarly editing. Conditions of 'War emergency' have created special difficulties in the path of intending publishers, both with regard to procurement of paper and the actual processes of printing, and it may be some time before the Administrative Committee is enabled to bring out any publication of the longer Manuscripts, but it is a matter for some satisfaction that this short but interesting prose work of Mahādeva is now before the public in an acceptable form.

Love of learning, schools, and works of intellectual emineoce has deep roots in our culture and civilisation. Even when the patronage of Kings and Courts declined, men in this country have kept alive the small flame of knowledge and enquiry. The attitude of Browning's 'Grammarian'

—"Grant I have mastered Learning's crabbed text ; still there's the comment," is typical of the avidity of our own *Savants* in the pursuit of Truth. It is to be hoped that in these days of a spreading democracy, these values will not be lost, and that an ardent public support will replace the patronage of Royalties

The Committee is deeply beholden to Dr V Raghavan, M A , Ph D of the Madras University, for the scholarly care, thoroughness and accuracy with which he has performed the important task of editing this work. A glance at the Table of Contents will show the facilities for reference and study provided by the Editor. The Committee must also express its indebtedness to the authorities of the Madras University for granting the necessary permission to Dr Raghavan to undertake this labour of love.

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
DEDICATION	II
FOREWORD	III
PREFACE	VI
INTRODUCTION	
Importance of the Work	1
Other Works of Similar Nature	1-2
Ravi Nartaka's Work based on Mahā- deva's	6-9
The Author Mahadeva	9-11
Mahādeva's Text and the Text of the Drama	11-17
The Story	18-29
Other Versions Jagaddhara's Trivan- dram Manuscript of the Drama, Ananta Bhatta, an Anonymous work in a Bikaner Manuscript, a Bengali edition of the Drama, the Drama Pratijñā Cānakya of Bhīma, The Purāṇas, the Brhatkathā, the Bud- dhistic Works, the Jain Works, the Greek Writers	29-92
The Sanskrit Text	1-10
NOTES (Textual, Traditional and His- torical)	1-XXIV
Notes on the Names in the Story	xxv- xlii
Index of Verses taken from the Drama	xlii
Concordance of Prose Passages taken from the Drama	xliii
ERRATA	xliv

## PREFACE

The Mudrārāksasanātakakathā of Mahādeva is published here for the first time from a single manuscript of it preserved in the Maharaja Serfojī's Saraswatī Mahal Library, Tanjore. It is a short prose work giving the story of the famous drama of Viśīkhadatta the Mudrārāksasa in the form of a simple narrative, and may be found suitable as a Sanskrit Prose Text for the Intermediate Classes in the Universities. In this book is to be seen the small beginning of a series of publications which the Saraswatī Mahal Library is inaugurating, and I am thankful to the Administrative Committee of the Library, particularly to its President Sri M. Anantanarayanan, M.A., I.C.S., Dt. Judge Tanjore, and to the Hon'y Secretary, Sri S. Gopalan, B.A., B.L., Tanjore, for inviting me to edit this work for the Library. It is a matter for congratulation that besides running a Journal, the Library has started the Saraswatī Mahal Series of publications in which will appear editions and works based on the rare and rich manuscript material available in the Library.

The single manuscript of this Kathā available in the Tanjore Library is not noticed in the Catalogue of the Library, it is in Telugu characters and the material is rough country paper.

measuring  $7\frac{1}{4}'' \times 10\frac{1}{4}''$  and numbering 33 sheets, it is bound in cardboards made up of similar paper, pasted together and containing some Tamil matter, here and there are to be seen some extraneous Telugu scribblings. The mistakes in the manuscript are few and the e have been corrected in the text presented here, in one instance (p 5), I have restored a missing word on the basis of an external testimonium, and in another (p 34), I have left a corrupt passage as it is with a question mark, making my suggestion for reconstructing the corrupt passage in the Notes. I am thankful to the Library Staff for providing me with a Devanagari copy of the text and to Dr N Venkataramanayya, M A, Ph D, Reader in Indian History, University of Madras, for helping me to compare this copy with the original Telugu manuscript and correct the elips.

At the end of the work, I have given textual, traditional and historical Notes, an Index of the characters in the story with a brief description and account of the part played by each, and an Index and concordance of verses and prose passages taken by Mahādeva from the original Drama. My Introduction in the beginning deals with all the known works which concern themselves with the story of the *Mudrārāksasa*, the author Mahādeva and his work, his probable date and the relation his text bears to the Drama, to these I

have added a free translation of Mahādeva's text, and accounts of the story of Nanda Candragupta and Cānakya as found in the several Brahminical, Buddhist, Jain and Greek sources. The book will thus be useful not only to students who study the difficult drama of Viśākhadatta in their college courses but also to those students of history who are interested in Mauryan research.

My thanks are due to the authorities of the University of Madras for permitting me to edit this work for the Maharaja Serfojus Saraswati Mahal Library Tanjore and also to the Proprietors of the Srinivasa Press Tiruvadi, Tanjore and Messrs Thompson & Co Madras, for executing the printing work.

As one who had worked in the Saraswati Mahal Library once I feel gratified at the opportunity afforded to me to associate myself with the work of the Library and I appeal to all scholars and patrons to bestow greater attention on a Library which possesses one of the best and biggest manuscript collections which South India might well be proud of and help the Library to further its activities and make itself more useful to the public.

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS }  
6th March 1945 }

V RAGHAVAN



## INTRODUCTION

The *Mudrārākṣasa* is one of the few Sanskrit dramas possessing a dominant story interest<sup>1</sup>. This interest pertains not only to the events falling within the scope of the drama but comprehends also the historical or quasi-historical background against which the theme of the drama has to be understood. The multiplicity of the incidents and their intricate interweaving in the drama-part of the story and the variety and confusion characterising the versions of the historical background of the story have both rendered the understanding of the *Mudrārākṣasa* difficult. Scholars had therefore found it necessary to tell the story of the *Mudrārākṣasa* in the form of a simple narrative. Such narratives that we know of are of four kinds, those that give an account of the historical background only, those that cover the story of the antecedents together with that of the drama, those in prose and those in verse.

Aufrecht records in his *Catalogus Catalogorum* (I. p 461) two Oppert manuscripts of a *Mudrārākṣasakathāsāra*, one in Bhavani, Coimbatore District, and another in the Maharajah's Palace Library, Trivandrum. Nothing can be known of the identity of the former manuscript; the latter, it is probable, represents the work of Ravi Nartaka which we shall notice below.

---

1 See my Foreword to the *Rajulaghvi* or *Mālatīmādhavakathā* edited by N. A. Gore, M.A., Oriental Book Agency, Poona.

Ananta Bhaṭṭa of Punyastambha on the Godāvarī, son of Tryambaka (Tūnāji) Pandita and grandfather of the logician Mahādeva Punatāmakara is a well known scholar of the middle of the 17th cent A D. He wrote his gloss on Govardhana's Aryāṣaṭṣaṭi in 1645 A D and his gloss on Bhānudatta's Rasamañjarī in 1636 A D at Benares. He wrote also a small work called Mudrārāksasa purvapāṭhikā or Mudrārāksasa pūrvāsankathānaka. This work is in prose and deals only with the introductory story leading up to the plot of the drama. Rajendralal Mitra describes a manuscript of it in his Notices IV, No 1654 and there are two more manuscripts of it in the Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner. The first version given by Jivananda Vidyasagar in his edition of the Mudrārāksasa is a summary of Ananta Bhaṭṭa's work.

In the Bikaner Library there is another manuscript containing an anonymous version in prose, concerning itself like Ananta's, with only the events leading up to the plot of the drama<sup>2</sup>

---

2 The ms begins

वाग्देवी गणनाथ च नमस्कृत्य उहनि । मुद्राराक्षसनाटयस्य क्रियते  
पूर्वपीठका ॥ अस्ति समस्तपुराणस्य स्पृष्टव्यम् etc

I am thankful to Mr K Madhava Krishna Sarma Curator of the Bikaner Library for supplying the information pertaining to these Bikaner mss. Dr C Kunhan Raja Hon'y Adviser to the Bikaner Library enlightened me on the nature of the stories in these two versions in the Bikaner mss. It is understood that these two versions are being published by the Anup Library Bikaner.

The third account is by Dhunḍhirāja, the well-known commentator on the *Mudrārākṣasa*, who prefaces his commentary with a metrical resumé of the incidents which happened before the action in the drama begins. Dhunḍhi belonged to a family called Vyāsa, was the son of Lakṣmaṇa, a resident of Swamimalai near Kumbhakonam in the Tanjore District, and a protégé of Tryambaka yajvan<sup>3</sup>, the minister of Serfoji I (A.D. 1711-1720) of Tanjore. Dhunḍhi finished his gloss on the *Mudrārākṣasa* in A.D. 1713. This metrical version is printed in Telang's edition of the *Mudrārākṣasa* with Dhunḍhi's commentary, and the second version given by Jivananda Vidyasagar in his edition of the drama is based on Dhunḍhi's verses. Dhunḍhi's account agrees with that of Mahādeva edited hero.

Tradition says that the famous Kerala scholar Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa of Melputtur (A.D. 1559-1666) composed most of his Prabandhas or compositions intended for the dance-exposition called Cākyār-kūttu for a Cākyār friend of his named Ravi. This Ravi Nartaka produced a metrical version of the entire story of the drama as well as the events that preceded it. This version may be called the Cāṇakyakathā and many manuscripts of it are found in the several manuscript libraries<sup>4</sup>. Ravi's work has been published, with a commentary by

3 Tryambakarāyamakhin finished his *Dharmākūta* on the *Rāmāyaṇa* in A.D. 1719

4 See for instance the *Descriptive Catalogue of the Maharajah's Palace Library, Trivandrum*, Nos. 1764-7; *Adyar Library*

Rajagopala of Madura (Madras 1882) and by Satish Churn Law (Calcutta Oriental Series, 6; Calcutta 1921)<sup>5</sup>

Catalogue II p 106 3 mss 27 H 27 2 H 29 and 24 A 4 Madras Government Oriental Mss Library Nos D 12180-3

The work is variously called in these mss The Trivandrum mss call it Mudīarākṣasakathasara the Adyar mss Mu Ra Kathasara and Mu Ra Kathasamgraha the Madras mss call it Kauṭīlyakathasāra

It is clear that scribes are responsible for a few additions and differences noticeable in some of these mss Though all the three Adyar mss represent only Ravi's work 27 H 27 represents a copy of an original from which verses 114 were missing and the scribe or somebody else supplied a different set of verses there and this Adyar ms. corresponds exactly to the Madras ms D 12183 in this respect The Trivandrum ms 164 ends with a different set of verses and Trivandrum 166 has a different verse on Sunandā's pregnancy

5 The Calcutta edn has many mistakes

10(b) नन्दपति for नन्दभूषति 18(b) गर्भं दधे for दधे गर्भम्  
31(b) Mss read नक्रनाश here as नक्रनास The drama calls him Vakranāsa 39(c) महीभार for महीभरम्.  
89(c) आमोचयिष्यत् for अमोचयिष्यत् 100(b) मन्त्रकृता for यन्त्रकृता 100(a) सगित् for सगित् 113(b) उत्प्रेक्ष्य for दुष्प्रेक्ष्य 115(d) सातोप सित for साटोपसितम्. 138(d) भोजन for भाजनम् 165(d) हिते for हि ते 196(a) दृष्ट्वा here is against the metre 207(b) पुरी for पुरी 238(d) स्मृतिम् for मृतिम् 254(b) पूव for पूर्वम् 274(a) साञ्चन for सञ्चन 279(c) अपूर्ववध for अपूर्वव्यय 279(d) जातहत for जानु हत 295(d) निरवारयत् for निरवासयत् 296(b) शूलारोहण for शूलारोपण 330(d) उपपन्नकपटे for उपपन्ने कपटे.

While describing an India Office manuscript of this work (No. 7124) Dr. A. B. Keith characterises Ravi's production as a 'version in slipshod verse'. When Ravi comes to the drama-part of the story he no doubt hurries over the narration, but his verses, especially in the earlier part of the work, are very well turned out and are strikingly accomplished<sup>6</sup>.

The fifth work giving an account of the Mudrārākṣasa story is the prose version of Mahādeva printed in the pages that follow. This work called the Mudrārākṣasanāṭakakathā deals with the story of the drama and the incidents that preceded the theme of the drama. As Ananta Bhaṭṭa, Dhunḍhirāja and the unknown author of the other version in a Bikaner manuscript have all dealt only with the incidents which led to the theme of the drama (Pūrvapīṭhikā), and as Ravi Nartaka's version hurries over the drama portion of the story, Mahādeva's, here presented for the first time in print, is the only work available now that gives us a full and good narrative of the entire story of the drama and its antecedent events.

---

331(h) चक्रदातृ for कृष्णदातृ. 344(a) प्राप्तचानक्याय for प्राप्त चानक्याय. 349(h) राक्षसमेव for राक्षसमेव. 349(d) श्रेष्ठ ददौ may be श्रेष्ठं ददौ. A revised edition will be welcome.

6 I am told by Dr C. Kunhan Raja that Ravi Nartaka's version is the basis of the Malayalam work on this subject named Cāpakyaśūtra.

In the beginning of his metrical version, Ravi Nartaka says that the story of Cānakya is available in prose form and that he is only retelling it in verses

चाणक्यस्य कथा सेयं विद्यते गद्यरूपिणी ।

अथ ता पद्यता नेनुमुद्यतो रविनर्तक ॥

What is the prose work that Ravi Nartaka had before him when he wrote his metrical version? It appears possible that the prose version referred to by him is Mahādeva's work edited here. Firstly, both attempt to cover the drama as well as its antecedent events; secondly, the *main* details of the story in both are identical, and thirdly, in addition to the identity of the major elements of the story many lines of Ravi Nartaka's version are close to Mahādeva's text. Ravi Nartaka has not slavishly turned the prose composition into verse, but has exercised freedom to make a departure from the original on some points, to add a few details and to introduce some minor innovations<sup>7</sup>

---

7 See the following in Ravi's version śloka 7 Ravi definitely mentions Sarvathasiddhi as otherwise called Nanda śl 13 Sunanda is said to have received the nine drops of the Padodaka in a mocking spirit śl 15 Maur's birth is put earlier śl 20 a heavenly voice is introduced to assure the king that in the mass of flesh nine sons have been born śl 29 the ghee-can of the prose version is an oil-can here śl 31 the minister Nakranāsa is introduced to suggest the ninefold partition of the kingdom śls. 35ff before the alternative of ruling the city by turns is proposed an additional solution of creating eight other capitals is suggested śl 50 the king sending the waxlion is named as the Valla or Vaṅga king śl 88 the old minister who mentions Candragupta's name is specified by name

These differences however do not alter the fact that Ravi Nartaka's text generally follows Mahādeva's work, as can be well realised by a

as Viśakha śl 96 the Nandas give Candragupta the Kośa of his father to induce him to come out of the cellar and not his father's office, śl 113 Capakya burns the grass to ash and not merely crushes it śl 122 Capakya does not introduce himself as a Dakṣiṇatyā śl. 138, 140 a 1000 seats for dinner, not 100 only śl 147 Capakya does not untie his tuft and swear but his tuft gets loose as he is dragged by it, śl 167, Induśarman creates first a fever he is then said to stop Brahman feeding at the palace, and then he creates an Unmādagraha śl 173 Candragupta is said to be banished by the Nandas śl 174 and Capakya makes him reside at a place called Vardhamana ten yojanas from the city śl 175 introduces a forest chief Śabara natha śl 180 as a camouflage Capakya advertises Parvata kṣvara as having declared enmity against some distant king and under pretext of going against him they proceed against the Nandas, śl 188 the date of the battle is given as Aśāḍha Kṛṣṇa pakṣa beginning instead of Vaiśākha pūrṇimā śl 193 Candragupta allies himself with Parvataka by giving him half his treasury śl. 197 200 in the battle between Candragupta and the Nandas, Candragupta meets Rākṣasa bows to him and offers to call off the battle if a portion of the kingdom is given to him Rākṣasa abuses him and asks him to fight śl. 208 211 Cūpakya besieges the city within which Sarvārthasiddhi and Rākṣasa are hidden and offers to raise the siege if Sarvārthasiddhi retires to the forest Sarvārthasiddhi does so hoping to come back to authority later but in śl 222 Ravi narrates Sarvārthasiddhi going to the forest as found in our prose version śl 225 makes Sarvārthasiddhi a party to the attempt on Candragupta's life śl 227 introduces a new attempt on Candragupta's life with a poison fruit sent by Sarvārthasiddhi through spies Capakya manages to substitute a good fruit in its stead and contrives to send the poison fruit to Sarvārthasiddhi himself who eats it and dies śl 267 Malaya

perusal of the two texts<sup>8</sup>. One passage can be mentioned here to bear out clearly the closeness of Ravi's work to Mahādeva's: When the Nandas and Rākṣasa are at a fix not knowing how to drive out the lion without breaking the cage, and an old minister there, attached to the late Maurya, mentions Candragupta as a master of such trials of wit, the manuscript of Mahādeva's version reads:—

‘मौर्यपुत्रेषु चरमः चन्द्रगुप्तः ईदृशकर्मस्वतीव पटुः ।  
इदानीं तया किं कर्तव्यम् ।’

In the second sentence here ‘*Idānīm tayā kim kartavyam*’, there is a clear gap, the word ‘*tayā*’ standing without the expression to which it refers; the sense must be ‘What use now of thinking of *that which is past*?’. That the word ‘*tayā*’ here qualifies an expression like ‘*gata cintayā*’ can be

ketu swears that he will not do his father's obsequies until he has killed his father's murderer.

8. Compare Mahādeva p 8, वक्तव्यं सर्वमुक्त्वा and Ravi in the same context वक्तव्यं शिप्रमुक्त्वा. śl. 155. Mah. p. 9, नन्दराज्यममैश्वर्य and Ravi 182 तेषुममैश्वर्य. Mah. p. 9, ब्राह्मणानां क्षणिकानां च सम्भासिद्धो विरोधः and Ravi 163, ब्राह्मणाः क्षणिकाश्चैव निचं वैरसमन्दिताः. Mah. p 9, मम पुरतः ब्राह्मणानां योग्यता कोदरी and Ravi 165—6, ब्राह्मणो नाम विन्विदम् ... ... तस्य को मत्समो भुवि. Mah. p. 9, हस्तस्थित-मयूरपिच्छिकाभ्रमणमात्रेण तां कृत्वां शमयन्मास and Ravi शमयामास पिच्छभ्रमणमात्रतः । Mah. p. 10, गूढचारमुखेन विदित्वा क्षणिकः नन्दसेनापतीनां गृहं गत्वा प्रत्येकं रहस्यवादीन् and Ravi 188 विज्ञानन् क्षणिकधरः । नन्दसेनारतीन् प्राप्य रहस्यैकैश्च निगन् ॥



safely made out from the corresponding context in Ravi's text where we read:

स हि मौर्यसुतश्चन्द्रगुप्तः शिल्पकलानिधिः ।  
 श्रमोचयिष्यत्यन्वाह्यं किं तथा गतचिन्तया ॥ 89.

Ravi must have had before him when he wrote this a passage running 'इदानीं तत्र गतचिन्तया किं कर्तव्यम्?'

## ii

From a verse of the author at the end of the work we learn that he was a Brahman of the Srivatsa gotra, that his name was Mahādeva Tirtha and that he was a scholar in both literature and philosophy.

श्रीमद्वत्सकुलान्पुरशिशायेभिः जीवेन तुल्यैर्धिया  
 काव्यालङ्कृतितन्त्रपटुचतुरैः स्यातैः क्षमामण्डले ।  
 नोतेर्वाोधयिता क्षमासुखमहादेवाख्यतीर्थः कृतो  
 मुद्राराक्षसनाटकोदितकथामागोऽगमत् पूरणम् ॥

We cannot be sure that the suffix Tirtha at the end of the name means that the author was a Sannyāsin, for Sannyāsins do not refer to details of their Pūrvāśrama like their Gotra; Tirtha probably is a family surname or is simply a general honorific expression.

The only manuscript that we have of the work is not dated; it is however not very old; from its script which is Telugu and general appearance, we may assume that the author of the work was a South Indian, probably patronised by the Tanjore

Court<sup>9</sup> If, as I have indicated above, Ravi Nartaka of Kerala refers to and follows this prose version in his Cānakyakathā, our author's date may be about A.D. 1600. Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa of Melpuṭṭūr who composed Prabandhas for the Cakyār, Ravi, and flourished between A.D. 1559 and 1666, was in contact with the scholars of the Tanjore Court. Bhaṭṭatīrī wrote the grammatical tract Apāniniya-pramāṇatā as a reply to certain views expressed by a writer named Vainateya of Tanjore, and sent the tract to the two Tanjore Scholars, Someśvara Dīkṣita and Yajñānārāyaṇa Dīkṣita for opinion<sup>10</sup>. Yajñānārāyaṇa Dīkṣita was the son of Govinda Dīkṣita, minister of King Raghunātha Naik of Tanjore (A.D. 1614-1632). In view of this literary contact, it is not impossible for Ravi Nartaka to have had access to Mahādeva's prose version even if it was available only at Tanjore.

A consideration of the readings of the Mudrā-rākṣasa text known to Mahādeva is a legitimate means of knowing the author's probable place, but this inquiry does not yield any valuable result here. There are several places where Mahādeva simply reproduces the text of the drama, as can be seen from the Index of verses and prose passages.

---

9 The only other Mahādeva among South Indian authors known as a Vatsya is the author of a commentary on Bhaṇu datta's Rasamanjarī. Madras Govt. Ori. Mss. Library R. No. 680 and Tanjore Sarasvatī Mahal Library No. 5784.

10 Edited by Pandit E. V. Raman Nampūtīrī. Ori. Mss. Library Trivandrum 1942. The edn. contains also Bhaṭṭatīrī's covering letter to the Tanjore scholars.

borrowed by Mahādeva from Viśākhadeva given at the end of this book. These passages may be used as additional testimonium for the determination of the text of the drama. Telang used ten manuscripts for his edition and Hillebrant twice that number for his, and these manuscripts are drawn from all parts of India. A detailed examination of the readings in Mahādeva's version with those recorded in the two editions mentioned above shows that the text of the drama which Mahādeva used is nearer Hillebrant's edition than Telang's, and among the manuscripts used by Hillebrant, those marked N, a Nepali manuscript, and M, a Malayālam Script manuscript belonging to the Burnell collection in the India Office (see Keith, India Office Catalogue 7366, Burnell ms. No. 103) generally agree with Mahādeva's text; but it must be noted that even here, there are certain characteristic M readings which are not to be seen in Mahādeva's text. Besides this Mahādeva has certain readings which are not to be found in any manuscript of the drama used for these two editions, and these perhaps, like some other changes, were due to some freedom which Mahādeva exercised when writing his narrative.

### iii

Mahādeva's Sanskrit is very simple, and does not show any great skill in composition that may be expected of one describing himself as a master of Kāvya, Alaṅkāra and Śāstra. But the loss on the side of marked literary merit has been a gain on the side of simplicity which is to be specially

valued in a narrative aiming at presenting an easily understandable account of a very complicated theme

So far as his narration of the incidents preceding the drama is concerned we do not know on what exact authority Mahādeva bases himself as can be seen in a subsequent section giving a survey of all the available versions of the story of the conflict between the Nandas and Canakya Candragupta the traditions are varied and confusing and all that is common to them is restricted to a few motifs incidents and names I have indicated in the Notes at the end where the details of our author's version are corroborated or contradicted by details in other versions

As the main task of Mahādeva is the presentation of the intricate plot of the *Mudraraksasa* in the form of a simple narrative it is necessary to consider whether Mahadeva has done this work satisfactorily As has been pointed out already Ravi Nartaka hurries over the story of the drama but such a defect does not pertain to Mahadeva's narrative which is neat and full explaining also to some extent the intentions and inter relations involved in the numerous schemes and incidents of the story One may wish that the author had devoted then and there more space to detailed analyses of these intentions and inter relations the motives and purposes of the schemes of Canakya and the cunning acts and speeches of his accomplices so that the greatness not only of Cānakya's genius but of Viśakhadatta too may be realised more easily by the general reader But if

Mahādeva has not stopped to dwell more on this, he has made his narrative move fast. The implications of several passages of the drama have been well worked out and set forth in proper order so that we have here a definite aid to the study of Viśākhadatta's drama.

There are, however, some points on which it cannot be said that Mahādeva was careful enough to understand fully the text of Viśākhadatta

bad resorted to black magic to do away with the nine Nandas. The Brhatkathā version, on which the Daśarūpaka says the drama Mudrārāksasa is based, definitely says that Cānakya raised an evil spirit in Śakaṭāla's house and with its aid did away with the Nandas. The drama says in IV 12 कौटिल्य कोपनोऽपि स्वयमभिचरणज्ञातुं खप्रतिद्वैष्टात्तार्णप्रतिज्ञं पुनरपि न करोत्यायतिग्लानिभीत ॥ that Kautilya resorted to black magic. The anonymous version in the Bikaner ms takes note of all these references and says that in the battle for Kusumapura, Cānakya practiced black magic against the Nandas. But Mahādeva's version does not speak of any Abhicāra done by Cānakya as part of the battle (pp 9—10), but he makes Jivasiddhi play a teacherous trick on all the commanders and prevent them from taking part in the battle, and the Nandas perish in the fight owing to the superior numbers of the armies of Candragupta and Parvatakeśvara. In the drama Rāksasa goes away from the city as soon as he despairs of any victory in the fight and espies signs of enemy infiltration, soon after the departure of Sarvārthasiddhi, but in Mahādeva's narrative, the departure comes after the Viśakanyā incident. After the defeat Mahādeva says, Rāksasa decides that as the tide is against him and he has no forces he will mark time and try to succeed by stratagems rather than by any other means and offers his pretended friendship to Candragupta posing as a friend he seduces Parvatakeśvara, he then plans to employ Jivasiddhi's Viśakanyā against Candragupta, but in this scheme it is Parvatakeśvara who suffers

fatally. On Parvatakeśvara's death, Rākṣasa gets afraid that his guilt will become public in the morning, enters the city that very night, despatches Sarvārthasiddhi in the guise of a recluse to the forest and runs away from the city after making arrangements for several subversive activities against Candragupta. From this it appears that Rākṣasa's surrender took place outside the city in the camp of Candragupta and Parvatakeśvara, and all this time Sarvārthasiddhi appears to have been within the city (Pp 11-13).

*P. 12, Act I, Verse 12.*—*Nandam Mayā sūnvayam.* This and several other passages in the drama using the word Nanda in the Singalur and referring to Sarvārthasiddhi, speak definitely of Sarvārthasiddhi also being called Nanda. Mahādeva does not mention Sarvārthasiddhi as being called Nanda.

*P. 71, Act I.*—The drama refers to Bhadrabhaṭa etc. as leaders, Pradhānapurusas, who threw their fortunes with Candragupta and rose to importance with his victory (Candragupta-sahoththāyins). Their respective offices, positions and relationship with Candragupta are also mentioned in the drama (Act III. pp 171-2). But Mahādeva fails to describe them thus and introduces them abruptly.

*P. 84, Act I.*—According to the drama the ring is got first, and as Cūṇakya was considering what he should write in the letter to be sealed with that ring, he is informed of Candragupta's intention to perform Parvatakeśvara's obsequies and present the latter's ornaments to Brahmans; and this puts an

idea into Cānākya's mind of effectively using the late Parvatakeśvara's ornaments now with Candragupta, it is after this that Cānākya arranges for the Brahman brothers, Viśvāvasu and two others, receiving them and selling them in Rāksasa's camp. Mahādeva puts the ornament episode first and narrates after that the incident of Nipunaka securing the ring. (pp 19-20) The drama gives also an indication (p 86) of Cānākya implicating the five kings Kaulūta Citravarman etc on Malayaketu's side in the treachery-scheme in the letter, but Mahādeva fails to give this indication (p 20)

*P. 142, Act II*—The drama says that it is Sakatadāsa who first notes the ring in Siddhārthaka's hand as bearing Rāksasa's name and reports the fact to Rāksasa who examines it. But for the purpose of his narrative, Mahādeva (p 23) omits such minor details, and such omissions are not unjustifiable.

*P. 146-7, Act II*—It is Sakatadāsa who sees some persons selling ornaments and sends them for Rāksasa's view, Rāksasa finds them valuable and orders their purchase. This again is another small detail overlooked by Mahādeva (p 19) who says simply that Rāksasa saw the ornaments and purchased them.

*P. 171-3, Act III*—The statement (Pramāṇa-lekha-yapatra) of Bhadrabhaṭa, Bhāgurāyana and others and the ostensible grounds on which they left Candragupta and joined Malayaketu are not mentioned by Mahādeva. Mahādeva briefly speaks on p 22 of the departure of Bhāgurāyana, Bhadrabhaṭa and others to Malayaketu's camp, and adds



here that they ran as if to capture Śakaṭadāsa, but really on the secret instructions of Cāṇakya. This running as if after Śakaṭadāsa cannot be supported by the drama. What we actually find in the drama (Act I, p 105) is that when Śakaṭadāsa's escape is reported, Cāṇakya orders that Bhāgurāyana, Bhadrabhaṭa and others are to be despatched to bring back Śakaṭadāsa, but is informed that those persons too had fled.

*P. 213-216, Act IV.*—Rākṣasa asks Kṣapānaka Jīvasiddhi for an auspicious day and time for starting on the campaign, and Jīvasiddhi mentions an ominous day and time. This is not included by Mahādeva in his narrative (p. 29).

*P. 192-3, Act IV. Verse 5.*—Malayaketu's vow to perform his father's obsequies only after destroying the enemies is a minor point ignored by Mahādeva.

*P. 269, Act VI.*—In the drama, it is said that when Rākṣasa left Malayaketu's camp and came to Pātālīpura for rescuing Candanadāsa, a spy of Cāṇakya named Udumbara or Undura shadowed Rākṣasa's movement and reported it to Cāṇakya. This spy and his work are omitted by Mahādeva (p. 35).

Of the differences between the drama and Mahādeva's narrative noted above, it may be seen that only a few are material discrepancies; of the rest a few are omissions which are not serious, and a few, minor points which might be ignored.

watch ; those versed in the epics say that Duryodhana and his brothers were also born in this same manner. Having thus thought about it, Rākṣasa acted accordingly. After some days then, the nine sons were born simultaneously. The king saw the ekilfulness of Rākṣasa and was immensely pleased, and others also saw and wondered at that achievement of Rākṣasa. Just at that time a son was born to Murā also and he, though horn of a Śūdra woman, was endowed with brilliant genius, was well-behaved towards superiors and an adept in polity.

In course of time the king celebrated the marriage of all his ten sons, and to Murā's son were then born a hundred sons, equal to their father in their qualities. The last of them known as Candragupta was exceedingly intelligent and well-grounded in statecraft. By reason of their endowments, these sons and their father Maurya as well won the hearts of all the people. Unable to bear that, the nine Nandas became jealous of these sons.

Once king Sarvārthasiddhi held counsel with his ministers with a view to instal on the throne one among his sons. At that time, knowing well that his father would not give the kingdom to him, a Śūdra's son, jealous Maurya created treacherous rupture between every one of the nine Nandas. Split up by Maurya's words, all of them quarrelled, each claiming the kingdom for himself. Rākṣasa then said that the kingdom must be divided into nine parts and given to all of them. Thereupon

Maurya secretly instigated them individually, one against the other, consequently all of them quarrelled, every one asking for himself the capital Pātalipura. Again, Raksasa suggested to them that by turns, each might rule over the city and the kingdom for one year, and again, as a result of Maurya's instigation, they quarrelled, each desiring his turn to be the first. Concluding within himself that all this was the doing of Maurya, Rāksasa pacified them and told them "When you fall out like this, the kingdom will become vulnerable hence you should not quarrel, we shall cast lots and let him rule first who draws the first year. Rāksasa counselled thus and did accordingly. That kingdom which was thus many-headed Rāksasa managed somehow to safeguard with the strength of his intellect. To Maurya he gave the place of the Commander of the army. Despite this arrangement Maurya, the father of hundred sons and one in the full know of the weak points, was only creating internal troubles for the nine Nandas.

The Nandas and Rāksasa therefore came to the conclusion that Maurya was their secret enemy and that he must therefore be done away with. To that purpose, that got ready an underground council chamber and there every day if there were important items of state work, the Nandas together with Maurya and his sons, and Rāksasa and the other ministers hold secret consultations. One day a messenger from Rāksasa called at the residence of Maurya and said in a hurry "Sir, there is some very important state business. Rāksasa and the

kings are in the counsel chamber for discussing it and summon you to be there quickly with your sons ; you must therefore come soon." Maurya heard it, believed it to be true and excitedly entered that underground hall. The very next moment after their entry, the entrance to the hall was blocked fast by the royal servants, with mud, wood etc. Entering in, they saw not the king, Rāksasa or anybody else, but saw there in a hundred and one dishes daintily dressed food and sauce for eating, as also an equal number of lamps. Thereupon Maurya told his sons "Alas ! we have all been duped by Rākṣasa and others, fools though they are ; who can surmount the dictates of Fate ? What should be done now ? If somehow we could wreak vengeance on our onemies, fame will be ours, even though we die ; methinks, he lives happily whose fame stands in the world ; hence whosoever amongst you has courage, let him collect together the food in these dishes and the oil in these lamps and hold his life with them ; if by the course of Fate he finds his way out, he will take revenge on our enemies ; the rest of us shall die even now ; even otherwise our death tomorrow is certain ; let us die today itself ; what is the gain in dying tomorrow ?" Hearing the father's words, Candragupta alone said, "If Fate is favourable and I get out, I will annihilate these enemies." Then having blessed Candragupta, Maurya, along with ninety-nine sons, passed away in a few days. And maintaining himself on that store of food, and thinking of the time for getting out, Candragupta lived in that cellar itself.

At that very time a man from a king of another realm brought a cage with a lion, approached the Nandas and said 'If there is any clever person in this realm, let him drive out the lion within, without breaking the cage. All of them, Raksasa and others who listened to those words did not know of any means of driving the lion out in that manner. At that juncture an old minister who was attached to Maurya said 'The last among the Maurya's sons, Candragupta is an adept in such acts, but what could be done now by thinking of that which is gone? Hearing those words of the old minister, hoping that Candragupta might be alive desiring to know what happened to Maurya and his sons and thanks also to the good luck of Candragupta the Nandas and Rāksasa opened the door of the underground counsel chamber. Then, seeing Candragupta alive the ministers joyously approached him and said "The Kings call you, come. Desirous though of getting out Candragupta told them 'My father my brothers, everybody is dead. I, this unlucky man am still alive, my breath does not stop what is there for me to do before those kings? Here I am also going to breathe my last in a few days. The kings themselves then came and consoled him in many ways, saying "Dear Candragupta be not afraid, come out we shall give you the position occupied by your father. As if under pressure Candragupta came out of the cellar. The Nandas showed him the lion in the cage and told him the matter pertaining to it. Candragupta pondered over it well, 'The lion is of wax, its movements are mechani-

cally controlled ; and its heir is artificial." Having come to this conclusion, Candragupta made the lion melt with red-hot iron rods. The kings were satisfied at this and thinking that if the command of the army was given to him, he would gradually destroy the army, they gave him authority over the dining hall. And Candragupta was attending to that work.

Candragupta was once standing outside the dining hall looking out for Brāhmaṇas. A Brāhmaṇa, young and effulgent, came at that time. As he was coming, a blade of grass pricked his foot and the Brāhmaṇa uprooted it, crushed it, mixed it with water and drank it. Wondering at that, Candragupta approached the Brāhmaṇa, bowed to him and asked "O ! Brāhmaṇa ! who are you ? why do you pound the grass and drink it ?" The Brāhmaṇa replied "Listen, I will tell you ; I am a Southerner, Cānakya by name ; this blade of grass wounded my feet ; if I do not pound it thus and drink it, my anger will not be allayed." Candragupta thereupon asked "Worshipful Sir, were a powerful king to do you wrong, what will you do then ?" Cānakya said "You do not know the strength of my intellect ; I am capable of vanquishing by my intellect alone a thousand or even a ten thousand kings ; let that be ; I hear there is a Śūdra (Vṛṣala) named Candragupta in charge of the dining hall of the Nandas ; where is he likely to be now ? I am extremely hungry now and I must go to him." Candragupta said "Worshipful Sir, I am Candragupta ; You can come and have

your food with pleasure" Cānakya then told him, "Oh Prince! as a result of my Brāhmanic nature, I called you Sūdra (Vṛsala) though you are a prince, you must excuse this fault of mine." Candragupta said "Respected Sir, that you have called me Sūdra (Vṛsala) is itself a blessing to me, and as long as I am alive I shall be the servant of your feet, and you must refer to me in the same manner." Having spoken thus, Candragupta started from the beginning and proceeding from one connected thing to another, narrated to Cānakya the trouble caused to him in a manner that Cānakya would take pity on him. Having then showed Cānakya the way to the dining hall and having requested Cānakya to come and sanctify his own home too on his departure after the dinner, Candragupta went away to his house.

Cānakya entered the dining hall. There were ten gold vessels and hundred silver ones for taking food and on seeing them Cānakya asked those that were there "For whom are these vessels?" They replied "Of the golden vessels, nine are for the kings, one is for a Brāhmana who knows all the branches of learning, and the other silver vessels are for other Brāhmanas. Cānakya seated himself in the seat of the Brāhmana of learning. The kings who came for dinner saw Cānakya and asked "Who is this beardless boy who is sitting in the first seat fit for a great scholar?" Cānakya said "Be I beardless or no, if there is any one my equal in learning, let him come forth." The Nandas then said "Throw out this haughty boy," and had him dragged away by their servants from that

seat. Dragged at that time in the midst of a concourse of people Cānakya untied his tuft of hair and swore in anger that he would tie his tuft after uprooting the Nandas and destroying them completely. The Nandas laughed that a hungry Brāhmana was prattling something.

Cānakya came out, proceeded to Candragupta's house, promised that he would kill the Nandas and give the kingdom to Candragupta, and told the latter everything necessary to be told in that connection. He then called a Brāhmana classmate of his named Induśarman and told him what was necessary to be told for his purpose, he approached the Mleccha chief named Parvatakeśvara, proclaimed before him his own capacity, informed him of the insult at the hands of the Nandas and his own vow and said 'If you come with your forces, and with my aid, destroy the Nandas I shall give you half the kingdom.' Parvatakeśvara thought "This Brahmana appears to be clever and one who knows the secrets of the Nanda kingdom, if I get his assistance I can capture the entire Nanda kingdom." Having decided thus Parvatakeśvara allied himself with Canakya and made his forces ready for fighting the Nandas.

Meantime, that friend of Cānakya the Brāhmana named Induśarman putting on the guise of a Jain monk and making himself known by the name of Jivas ddhi approached Raksasa, exhibited to him his proficiency in polity, astronomy and incantation and stayed with him as his protégé. Rāksasa also thought "The Brāhmana named



Cāṇakya departed with resolute enmity; and he will perhaps do black magic against us; we have a friend in this Jain monk Jivasiddhi; there is habitual enmity between Brāhmaṇas and Jain monks and hence this Jivasiddhi will counter the black magic and the rest which Cāṇakya will do." Having thought so, Rākṣasa became a thick friend of Jivasiddhi. Thus, as a result of the friendship with the chief person, Rākṣasa, all the army chiefs there came under the influence of Jivasiddhi. Once he secretly told Rākṣasa and others that in a particular month on a particular day, they would have some trouble; and raising on that very day an evil spirit and creating thereby fear in them, he told them that some Brāhmaṇa had raised an evil spirit against them, that he would put it down and that before him the worth of the Brāhmaṇas was nothing. He then put down that evil spirit by the mere wave of the bunch of peacock feathers in his hand. By this and other similar instances of his capability which had been proved true to their very eyes, greater became the confidence of Rākṣasa and others in him. What Jivasiddhi said, none did otherwise.

When matters stood thus, Jivasiddhi learnt through secret spies that on a particular day Parvatakeśvara was coming for a battle with the Nandas and went to the houses of the chiefs of the Nanda forces and told them individually and secretly "On the coming full moon day of the Vaiśākha month, the movement of planets is adverse to you; on that day there will be a big

hattle for the king ; if you go for the fight on that day, you will die ; hence, you ought not to go ; let this be between ourselves and not be told to anybody." In this manner Jivasiddhi informed privately everyone of the ministers and soldiers individually and everyone of them took his words as true. When this was so, on the full-moon day of the Vaiśākha month, Parvatakeśvara and Cānakya, with huge Mleccha forces, besieged Pāṭalipura. Rāksasa ordered all his commanders to fight but all of them owing to the faith in the Jain monk's words, concluded that they would die if they went forth for battle on that day and did not proceed to the fight. The nine Nandas and Rāksasa, with a few soldiers, issued out of the city and fought the Mlecchas. Thereupon owing to the meagre numbers on their side, the nine Nandas were killed by the numerous forces of Parvatakeśvara which were being assisted by the brain power of Cānakya. Owing to his own exceeding prowess and the (planned) neglect of Cānakya, Rāksasa alone was left unhurt.

Rāksasa, extremely dejected at the destruction of his masters, thought " Our masters, who like parents, protected us, and were most compassionate to those who resorted to them, all the nine of them died simultaneously through an accursed Fate ; if I too follow my master dying, like a woman, while the enemies are yet alive and no vengeance has been taken, I will become the object of ridicule by the people ; I being single, the enemies who are numerous, cannot be vanquished by the four's expe-

dient namely war hence, they must be gradually vanquished by the strength of my intellect by vanquishing them and establishing in the kingdom the old Sarvārthasiddhi himself the ancestor of our master's family as king I must free myself from the debt of having eaten long at the hands of my masters Having resolved thus Raksasa hid his jealousy within himself and made peace with Candragupta Cınakya and Parvatakeśvara He went to Candragupta bowed to him and said 'Fortunately you have become the king of this kingdom to us you are also a son of our Lord (Sarvārthasiddhi) and the Nandas too were sons of our Lord Having received Candragupta's congratulation (for this sentiment) Raksasa once approached Parvatakeśvara in private and seduced him This Candragupta is a Śudra offspring and has no right to this kingdom therefore I shall kill him by a ruse and give you the entire kingdom and the Brahmana Cınakya repudiated by you will run away somewhere Parvatakeśvara accepted all that Raksasa said and between Parvatakeśvara and Raksasa special friendship developed

Cınakya on his part found out by the power of his intellect the intention of Raksasa he thought Even though we have secured victory we cannot quickly enter the city of Pāṭalipura, Raksasa might have designed some means to kill us through some ruse therefore we must enter the city after clearing the city of all that danger, further I have told Parvatakeśvara previously that for his aid in the war I would give him half the

kingdom, and he has to be killed by some deceitful means; otherwise the gift of the entire kingdom which I have promised to Candragupta would not be fulfilled." Having thought thus, Cāṇakya stayed for some days outside the city together with Candragupta and Parvatakeśvara watching the doings of Rākṣasa through spies.

At this juncture Rākṣasa asked the Jain monk some means to kill Candragupta secretly; and the Jain monk told Rākṣasa "I shall create an evil spirit in the form of an extremely beautiful woman of youthful form; if a man enjoys her but once, the spirit kills him that very moment and also herself disappears." Having said so, the monk created the poison-damsel and gave her to Rākṣasa. Deciding that with that damsel Candragupta could be killed, and with his desire almost fulfilled, Rākṣasa came to Candragupta in the night with the damsel, whom Candragupta, Cāṇakya, and Parvatakeśvara were sitting together in the hall; he told Candragupta "My Lord! a gem of a woman in youth, of beautiful form, is in my possession and I have brought her to my Lord's presence considering her as being proper for my Lord." Saying thus, Rākṣasa presented that damsel. Candragupta and Parvatakeśvara saw her and became infatuated with love. Cāṇakya had already learnt from the Jain monk about the poison-damsel. Deciding that he must have Parvatakeśvara, the depriver of half of their kingdom killed, he told Candragupta "It is not proper for you to enjoy this gem of a woman without first offering her to Parvatakeśvara your great

benefactor On the word of Cānakya Candragupta too agreed to that

Parvatakeśvara took the damsel entered the bedroom with supreme joy and was killed while in sport with her I began something but it resulted in something different, endeavouring to kill Candragupta I killed my friend Parvatakeśvara who was as claimant to half of the empire Candragupta's adversary owing to my ignorance and hastiness I did not inform Parvatakeśvara previously of this matter now, finding in the morning Parvatakeśvara dead and the poison damsel disappeared, the accursed Candragupta will put an end to me with terrible punishment hence I must run away from this place in the night itself and having run away I must make effort to uproot Candragupta by some means or other Having resolved thus Rakṣasa entered the city despatched Sarvārthasiddhi to the forest in the guise of a recluse enjoined Dāruvarman and other reliable friends to murder Candragupta by ruse kept there with a huge sum of money his most intimate friend a Kāyastha named Sakatadāsa for the purpose of setting Daruvarman and others in action entrusted his own family wife children and others to Candanadasa a leader of the jeweller's community and fled

On the next morning those in Candragupta's camp finding Parvatakeśvara not come out of the bedroom broke open the door and found that Parvatakeśvara was dead and the damsel had disappeared Then appearing to be dejected that their

benefactor and friend Parvatakeśvara had been maliciously killed by Rākṣasa, Cāṇakya commanded the spies "Where is this villain Rākṣasa? Capture him". The spies searched for Rākṣasa and informed Cāṇakya that Rākṣasa had fled in the the night itself and was not to be found. Cāṇakya thought "Parvatakeśvara who was to have deprived us of half of the kingdom has been killed deceitfully; but his son Malayaketu and brother Vairodhaka are still there, and the half kingdom already promised has to be given to those two; hence the killing of Parvatakeśvara has resulted only in the calumny of betrayal; but if therefore I try to kill them too, I shall only be firmly establishing the great ignominy that out of avarice for the kingdom it was Cāṇakya who murdered even his best friends; Malayaketu must be made to return to his own country through some advice or other given by Bhāgurāyaṇa who must be first made to establish his feigned friendship with Malayaketu; and I shall keep Vairodhaka here and afterwards think of some means to put an end to him." Having decided thus, Cāṇakya set Bhāgurāyaṇa to separate Malayaketu.

Bhāgurāyaṇa secretly explained to Malayaketu who was stricken with the grief of his father's death "Prince! this Cāṇakya is a thoroughly ungrateful man; he first sought the aid of king Parvatakeśvara with the promise of half the kingdom and when all the enemies had been uprooted completely by king Parvatakeśvara who had trusted Cāṇakya's words, Cāṇakya, that

damned betrayer of friend, unwilling to give half the kingdom, killed king Parvatakeśvara by a ruse; if, after this you stay here even for a moment, I do not know what harm Cānākya will try to do you, therefore, as one alive can come by many chances of good fortune you go to your country and think of the ways to wreak vengeance on this brat of a Cānākya ' On hearing this, that very moment Malayaketu went away to his country with his armies Vairodhaka however, comforted by Canakya, continued to live there, greedy as he was of half the kingdom

Rāksasa, who had fled earlier heard of Malayaketu's desertion, resorted to him and promised him "The wicked Cānākya lie upon him, has wantonly destroyed the family of my masters, I do not mind even that, but our great friend Parvatakeśvara has been killed by him deceitfully, I shall uproot Candragupta along with Cānākya and crown you Malayaketu knew Rāksasa's powers, accepted his proposal and appointed Rākṣasa as his Chief Minister There were five kings under the control of Malayaketu Citravarmaṇ king of the Kaulūtas Simhanāda the king of Malaya, Puskarākṣa king of Kāśmīra, Sindhusena king of the Sindhu country and Meghāṅka the king of Pārasika Rākṣasa and Malayaketu told them "We must vanquish Candragupta with your aid and then we shall give you Candragupta's territory, elephants, horses, etc They agreed and remained there mobilising their forces, seeing the wonderful qualities of Rāksasa they also became specially attached to him

Staying there with them, Rākṣasa was egging on his friends at Pāṭalipura, Jivasiddhi and others, for doing away with Cāṇakya and Candragupta. When things were like this, Cāṇakya called all the artists and architects of Pāṭalipura and ordered them "Astrologers have fixed an auspicious time this night for Candragupta's entry into the palace; you must therefore quickly decorate the way to the city gate." They replied "Sir, guessing about the forthcoming entry of Candragupta into the palace of the Nandas, the architect Dāruvarman has already decorated the gate-way to the royal mansion with gilded arches etc; we must do the decorations in the interior." On hearing that, Cāṇakya began seriously to suspect that out of mental delusion or of exceeding devotion to the enemy, Dāruvarman had decorated the palace gate without waiting for the time of order; as if pleased, Cāṇakya told the artisans aloud "Dāruvarman! You shall soon get the fruit proper for this dexterity of yours." Then Cāṇakya made the artisans and citizens understand that in accordance with the propitious moment, Candragupta's entry into the palace of the Nandas would take place at midnight; and at that very moment, he seated Vairodhaka, brother of Parvatakeśvara in the same seat with Candragupta and divided the kingdom between them; then with the entry of Candragupta into the palace of the Nandas already announced, Vairodhaka, who had been anointed, entered the mansion of the Nandas, followed by the royal entourage which used to follow Candragupta, mounted with Cāṇakya's permission on the



female elephant named Candralekhā which used to carry Candragupta, and with an appearance not recognised even by those most familiar, his broad chest shining with fragrant garlands thrown across, his beautiful crest fastened with a jewel diadem, and his body covered with a gem set, multicoloured garment worked with designs of rows of pure pearls. When Vairodhaka was thus entering the palace, the architect Dāruvarman, who had been instigated by Rāksasa, took him to be Candragupta and set the machine-arch ready to be brought down upon Vairodhaka. Meanwhile, with their horses held up, those of Candragupta's retinue who were following, stopped, Candragupta's *mahout* who had been instigated by Rāksasa wanted to kill Vairodhaka mistaking him for Candragupta and took hold of the golden staff hanging from his belt of golden chain, desirous of drawing out the dagger kept within the golden staff, imagining thereupon that the *mahout* was going to strike her on the rear with the staff, the female elephant took to a different gait in great speed, Barbaraka who had drawn out the dagger to kill Vairodhaka under the impression that it was Candragupta, was, without even getting at Vairodhaka, killed by the machine-arch, which fell out of target, having been set and released in accordance with the first gait of the elephant. Dāruvarman understood that the fall of the machine-arch was going to result only in his own death, quickly got upon the high arch, drew out the metal rod fastening the machine-arch, throw down the arch, and killed poor Vairodhaka even

as he was sitting on the elephant. Then Dāruvarman also was stoned to death by the footmen in Vairodhaka's retinue. Having thus done away with Vairodhaka who was to have taken away half the kingdom, and also Dāruvarman, who wanted to kill Candragupta, Cānakya entered the palace of the Nandas accompanied by Candragupta without a single hurt.

After this, a royal doctor, Ahbayadatta by name, who was a friend of Rāksasa gave a medicine to Candragupta. Cānakya, who was seeing that, found that the medicine produced a different colour in a gold vessel, and told Chandragupta that the medicine contained poison and must not be taken. The doctor himself was then made to take that medicine and die. At the same time, Pramodaka, who was attending on Candragupta at his bedside and who had been instigated by Rāksasa to kill Candragupta secretly, began to spend lavishly and enjoy himself with the huge riches previously given to him by Rāksasa, called by Cānakya and asked wherefrom he got so much wealth. He made many conflicting answers, Pramodaka was then put to death by torture. Bibhatsa and others who were employed by Rākṣasa to kill Candragupta in sleep had in advance got into an underground passage in the interior of the bedroom and were living there, entering the bedchamber before Candragupta's entry. Cānakya examined the chamber, he then saw a row of ants issuing out of a hole in the wall with particles of food, and understanding that the chamber was already inhabited by men in concealment, he ordered the chamber

itself to be burnt; when it was being consumed by flames, Bibhatsa and others perished in the fire, with their sights obstructed by smoke and unable to trace the exit previously laid out.

From that time Cāṇakya was a thousand times more careful. He sent out spies in various guises to find out the friends of Rākṣasa living in Pāṭalī-pura and to know what kind of harm would come from whom. At the same time Cāṇakya thought about the wonderful prowess of Rākṣasa, his mastery of statecraft, and the firmness of his devotion to his masters, and deliberated within himself: "I must make an effort to establish Rākṣasa himself in the office of minister, to Candragupta; otherwise there can be no stability to Candragupta's kingship; having established him so, and fulfilled my vow, I must go to the hermitage to do penance as before; and Rākṣasa, owing to his exceeding devotion to his old masters, will never come to terms with us; he, like a wild-elephant has therefore to be caught through a ruse; first of all, he cannot be made to accept the ministership of Candragupta so long as even a single member of the Nanda line is alive; but he can be rendered incapable of action in the matter of attacking Candragupta." Having thought like this, Cāṇakya put an end to Sarvārthasiddhi of Nanda's family who was a recluse in a hermitage, and was searching for some means to capture Rākṣasa.

Candragupta performed on the permission of Cāṇakya the obsequies of Parvatakeśvara and

presented the very valuable ornaments previously worn by Parvatakeśvara to the three brothers, Viśvāvasu and others sent by Cānakya. Calling secretly the brothers who had received the ornaments, Cānakya asked them to go to Malayaketu's camp, sell them to Rāksasa and return. The brothers went accordingly and showed the ornaments to Rāksasa. Without knowing that they were Parvatakeśvara's ornaments but finding them to be highly valuable and available for sale, Rāksasa gratified the brothers by paying a huge price and kept those ornaments in his treasury.

Of the spies of Cānakya, one Nipunaka by name had taken the scroll depicting the scenes of hell with which one could enter another's house without being suspected, and while going about house after house inculcating Dharma and heging, he entered once the house of Candanadāsa, the chief of the jewellers, living in Pātali-pura. He spread there the pictures of hell and was singing songs of Dharma. When he was singing, a boy about five years of age and of very graceful appearance, heard the songs and with eyes broad with curiosity, issued out of an inner apartment. Upon that, a great uproar by women arose from the midst of the inner apartment. "Ah, he has gone out, he has gone out." Among them, a very beautiful woman, with her face slightly visible at the door, stretched out her hand and quickly disappeared inside with the boy, and from her slender fingers busy in restraining the boy from going out, a ring made to the size of a male finger slipped down, revolved and reached the foot.

Nipunaka The lady did not know the slipping of that ring Nipunaka took the ring, read upon it the name of Rāksasa and came to the conclusion that the ring was Rāksasa's, that that woman from whose hand the ring slipped was Rāksasa's wife, that the boy was Rāksasa's son and that undoubtedly Rāksasa had entrusted his wife, son and others to his great friend Candanadāsa and left the city Nipunaka went to Cānakya with the ring, gave it to him and told him the whole story

Cānakya was overjoyed at the gain of that ring, and resolving that Rāksasa must be caught with that very ring, he wrote some letter. He then called Siddhārthaka who had been made to keep a feigned friendship with Sakatadāsa, a beloved friend of Rāksasa, gave him the letter and ordered "In these words somebody must himself say something to somebody else, tell Sakatadāsa like that and ask him to write this letter without the address and come to me with that letter, do not tell him that Cānakya asked him to write" Siddhārthaka had the letter written accordingly by Sakatadāsa and showed it to Cānakya Cānakya sealed the letter with Rāksasa's ring, gave both the letter and the ring to Siddhārthaka and told him "I desire to send you on a mission to be done by a trusted person and in that work you must justify your name Siddhārthaka (one whose object is achieved), Śakatadāsa will be taken to the stake on the orders of the king, you must go there in advance and give the executioners the sign of an angry wink of your right eye, and when at that time, they run helter skelter in apparent fright, you

must take away Śakaṭadāsa from the stake to Rākṣasa; from Rākṣasa, who will be pleased at the saving of his friend's life, you must accept a present; you must serve Rākṣasa for some time; and then, when our forces are near the enemy, you must do *this* service." So saying, he whispered something into the ear of Siddhārthaka. This and the meaning of the letter previously mentioned will both become clear afterwards.

Siddhārthaka agreed to do so, saluted Cāṇakya and departed. Cāṇakya then decreed "The Jain monk Jivasiddhi, who at the instigation of Rākṣasa, killed Parvatakeśvara with the poison-damsel, let him be proclaimed for this same crime and be banished from the city in ignominy; the other man, the writer known as Śakaṭadāsa, who at the instigation of Rākṣasa is attempting always on our life, let him also be proclaimed for this crime and impaled; and let the members of his family be imprisoned." Cāṇakya then sent for the chief of the jewellers, Candanadāsa. As soon as he was called by Cāṇakya, Candanadāsa sent Rākṣasa's family elsewhere through Dhanasena and others who were in his house, and then came to Cāṇakya. Though he was requested by Cāṇakya to surrender the family of Rākṣasa left in his house, Candanadāsa only denied their staying in his house. Cāṇakya was thence extremely infuriated and ordered Durgapāla "This Candanadāsa has brought over to his house Rākṣasa's wife, and does not give her up even if we entreat him; therefore confiscate his household belongings and keep him along with his wife and son in custody until

I inform Candragupta so that the king himself may decree his capital punishment" Durgapāla took the order and departed with Candanadāsa. Candanadāsa on his part was without any fear at losing his life owing to his devotion to the cause of his friend Rāksasa. Cānakya thought "Even as this man gives up his life as if it is not dear to him when there is danger to that man, even so will that man's life be not dear to him when this man is in danger, therefore Rāksasa is now secured"

The Jain monk banished in disgrace from the city went to Rāksasa and stayed with him as before. Siddhārtaka went away taking Sakatadāsa too in the manner already described. Cānakya heard of this and, though pleased at heart appeared outwardly to be very angry, and as if sent by him to capture Sakatadāsa, Bhūgurāyana, Bhadrabhaṭa, Purusadatta, Dingarāta, Balagupta, Rājasena, Rohitākṣa and Vijayavarman, all of whom had already been secretly commissioned by Cānakya ran away to Malayaketu's camp. Of this also Cānakya heard, put on much fury, and said that he would round up all of them. He was certain that Rāksasa was now caught.

Meanwhile a spy of Rāksasa, Virādhagupta by name, in the guise of a snake charmer enquired of the entire news of Pātalipura from the time of Rāksasa's exit up to the taking away of Sakatadāsa to the stake, returned to Malayaketu's camp and informed Rāksasa. Rāksasa heard of the killing of Dīruvarman and others and grieved over it. Hearing of the impalement of his beloved friend

Śakatadāsa, Rākṣasa was plunged into deep sorrow and he shed profuse tears. At that very moment Śakatadāsa along with Siddhārthaka approached Rākṣasa and saluted him. Looking upon Śakatadāsa as if he was released from death's own mouth and as if he was born again, Rākṣasa rose up in haste, embraced him and asked by whom he was saved from impalement. "By this dear friend, Siddhārthaka, I was saved from the Death's mouth of Cāṇakya and brought to you, Revered Minister!" So saying Śakatadāsa pointed out Siddhārthaka. Rākṣasa gave Siddhārthaka as presents the ornaments which he was himself wearing at that



come to another's hand? , and asked Good Siddhārthaka, wherefrom did you get this ring? . Siddhārthaka replied There lives in Pāṭalipura a leader of the jewellers named Candanadāsa this ring was lying at his door and I got it Rāṣasa thought it possible gratified Siddhārthaka with a big prize for the ring took it and then gave it back to him with the words that in future he should act in his capacity with the seal of that ring Siddhārthaka agreed, took back the ring and was observing the duties of his post

With the secret permission of Cānaka, Bhāguriyana left Pāṭalipura and went over to Malayaketu Out of gratitude that Bhāguriyana saved his life from Cānaka and out of friendship, Malayaketu placed Bhāguriyana in authority next to himself, and Bhāguriyana was awaiting the time to create a split between Rāṣasa and Malayaketu Bhadrabaṭa and others who had run away from Pāṭalipura sought Malayaketu's audience through Malayaketu's commander Silharala Malayaketu took them to have deserted Cānaka and come there, and placed them in offices suitable to each like the command of the army of the elephant corps of the calvary and so on Rāṣasa on his part strove to create a split between Cānaka and Candragupta and began sending spies for that purpose to Pāṭalipura

When things stood thus Cānaka privately told Candragupta You must carry on for some time without me you must enact even such things as transgression of my command thereby

there is some purpose to be achieved by us." Candragupta reluctantly accepted to do so. Then at the beginning of autumn once, Candragupta ordered his citizens that the Kaumudi Mahotsava (great festival of moonlight) must be celebrated in the city; the citizens were supremely happy; but Cāṇakya, on hearing that, prohibited the citizens that the festival of moonlight ought not to be celebrated. Angry then on looking at the city without the festival, Candragupta learnt that the festival was prohibited by Cāṇakya; he called Cāṇakya and asked him "For what purpose, Sir, have you cancelled the festival? Never has any move of yours, noble Sir, been without a purpose." Cāṇakya replied "Listen to me King! the writers on Polity describe three kinds of success: that dependent on the king, that on the minister and that on both; and what need to search for the purpose for you whose success is dependent on the minister?" Hearing this, Candragupta turned aside his face as if in anger. At this juncture, the minstrel instigated by Rākṣasa sang in praise of Candragupta "A master does not become one by merely putting on ornaments etc.; one like you whose command is not ignored by others is said to be the real master." Cāṇakya heard this and understood Rākṣasa's stratagem in it. Candragupta ordered ten thousand gold pieces to be given to that minstrel; Cāṇakya said that it should not be given; "Wherefore is this huge expenditure of money incurred for an unworthy purpose?". Candragupta said "With my actions obstructed by you on all sides, I do not relish this

kingship which is like fetters to me" Cānākya said "Such defects do affect kings who are not themselves at the helm of affairs" If, therefore, you cannot put up with the situation, you yourself take charge of the affairs" Candragupta said "Here, I shall myself attend to my office" Cānākya said "It is to my welfare, I shall also attend to my own duty" Candragupta asked "If so, I desire to know the purpose of cancelling the Kaumudi Mahotsava" Cānākya retorted "I also desire to know the purpose of observing the Kaumudi Mahotsava" Candragupta said "First of all, your veto of my command" Cānākya said "My first purpose of the cancellation is also the overriding of your order, if you want to know the second purpose also, I shall tell you: having known our vulnerable points through Bhadrabhata and others who had deserted us and resorted to him, and listening to the advice of Rāksasa, Malayaketu, surrounded by the vast army of Mleccha chiefs, is ready to attack us in his anger at the murder of his father, this is time for military exercise, not for festivity; when we have started the work of setting aright the forts, what for is the Kaumudi Mahotsava? Hence did I stop the festival"

Candragupta said "Sir, there are many things that I have to ask" Cānākya said "Ask without hesitation, there is much that I must tell you" "I shall ask now" said Candragupta "I shall tell you" said Cānākya Candragupta asked "That Malayaketu who is the root cause of all this trouble for us,—wherefore was he ignored when he fled?" Cānākya said "Two courses were possible

if Malayaketu's flight was not to be ignored: his detention or the gift of half the kingdom already promised; by his detention we would have only ourselves accepted the guilt of the ungrateful killing of Parvatakeśvara; by giving the promised half of the kingdom, the death of Parvatakeśvara would have borne only one fruit, namely, ingratitude; hence was the fleeing of Malayaketu ignored." Candragupta said "Let this be so: Rākṣasa was staying here within the city itself and he was ignored by you; what reply have you for that?". Cāṇakya replied "Owing to his steadfast devotion to his masters, the late Nandas, and owing to his long stay in this very place, Rākṣasa is in the position of one enjoying the supreme confidence of the subjects still attached to the Nandas; further he is a person endowed with brain and heroism; if he stays within the city, equipped with friends as well as money, he will foment an internal revolution; if kept away, he could be tackled even if he brings trouble from outside; hence was he ignored while fleeing; if we overpower and capture him, he will slaughter our forces or will himself perish; if that happens, all this effort we have taken to bring him round will be futile." Candragupta said "I am not able to score over you in speech; but I must say, in all respects, Rākṣasa is indeed superior." Cāṇakya said "Not you, is, I suppose, the rest of the sentence! What has Rākṣasa done?". Candragupta: "What have you done, Sir?". Cāṇakya: "I uprooted the Nanda with his family and established you in the kingdom". Candragupta: "This was done by Fate which was

inimical to Nanda's family." Cāṇakya: "Fools rely on Fate." Candragupta: "And wise men do not brag."

On hearing that, Cāṇakya feigned great anger; subduing his anger again, he said, "You, Śūdra! If Rākṣasa is more praiseworthy than me, here, take back this sword," and throwing the sword, he retired to his residence. Candragupta ordered it to be proclaimed in the city that he was himself carrying on his state duties, ignoring Cāṇakya, and retired to his inner apartments. And the whole of this episode became known to Rākṣasa through Karabhaka.

When matters stood thus, Malayaketu once asked Bhāgurāyaṇa "My friend, Bhāgurāyaṇa! Bhadrabhata and others who came over to me told me that they sought me not through minister Rākṣasa, but having deserted Candragupta who was under the influence of an evil minister, they were approaching me through my commander Śikhara-sena; though I have been exercising my mind since then, I do not grasp their intention in saying so; what is the reason for resorting to a different medium of introduction, leaving off Rākṣasa, our greatest benefactor and friend?". Bhāgurāyaṇa thereupon said "Prince, it is like this: Rākṣasa's fury is only towards Cāṇakya, and not towards Candragupta; if perchance Candragupta, unable to put up with the haughty Cāṇakya, repudiates him, Rākṣasa may make peace with Candragupta out of devotion to him as a member of the Nanda family and out of consideration for the release of

his friends in detention in the capital; if it is so, you will not trust Bhadrabhaṭa and others too; this intention of Bhadrabhaṭa and others is plain indeed." Malayaketu listened to this and accepted it as proper. Later, when Malayaketu heard the news that Candragupta, seduced by Rākṣasa's spies like Stanakalaśa and others, had repudiated Cāṇakya, what Bhāgurāyaṇa told became reinforced in the mind of Malayaketu. Thereafter, though suspicious of Rākṣasa, Malayaketu appeared, for the sake of his own purpose, to have the same confidence in him.

Now, Malayaketu, Rākṣasa and others started with their armies to besiege Pāṭalipura. Rākṣasa ordered the five kings, Citravarmaṇ and the rest, to march in a ring round Malayaketu, and others, Magadhas, Gāndhāras and Yavanas, to occupy the army front and other places appropriate to them. As day by day Pāṭalipura was approaching, Rākṣasa thought that the spies of Cāṇakya would deceitfully come and create internal dissensions in his camp and made the rule that persons could go out or come into their camp only with the stamp of his seal; and Bhāgurāyaṇa was entrusted with the granting of that seal (of permit).

. At this juncture, the Jain monk Jivasiddhi, appearing to have some disagreement with Rākṣasa, went to Bhāgurāyaṇa, and requested for the seal (of permit) for going out of the camp. Bhāgurāyaṇa asked him the reason why he was going away leaving his intimate friend, Minister Rākṣasa. Without telling the reason for his departure, Jivasiddhi said that

he was going to some place where even the name of Rāksasa would not be heard and exhibited a great deal of anger against Rāksasa. Asked by Bhāgurāyana with some compulsion Jivasiddhi told, as if with reluctance, "Unfortunately, I became Rāksasa's friend at first, at that time Rāksasa secretly raised the poison-damsel and killed Parvatakeśvara, Cānakya heard of this and banished me from the country, now too, Rāksasa, adept in statecraft, is beginning something like that by which I shall be banished from this world itself, hence, I have left Rāksasa and am determined to go away somewhere." Bhāgurāyana heard this and informed Malayaketu too. Thereupon Malayaketu decided that Rāksasa had killed Parvatakeśvara and resolved to kill Rāksasa. Remembering then the command of Cānakya that Rāksasa's life must be saved, Bhāgurāyana advised Malayaketu 'Prince! formerly when Sarvārthasiddhi was alive, Rāksasa wanted to crown him in the kingdom, and as Parvatakeśvara, even as Candragupta, was likely to take away the kingdom and was thus an enemy killed Parvatakeśvara, now that Sarvārthasiddhi has been killed, the basis for such enmity is no more present and I do not see any harm from Rāksasa, further, we can keep Rāksasa till we gain the Nanda kingdom and we can then retain or abandon him. As Bhāgurāyana was speaking thus, a man named Dīrghacaksus who was in charge of an army outpost brought Siddhārthaka bound on the back, having in his hand a letter sealed with Rāksasa's ring, but without the permit of Rāksasa's seal, and told Bhāgurāyana

“Sir, this man has been brought here, going out of the camp without getting your seal of permit.” Bhāgurāyaṇa asked Siddhārtaka “Are you a new-comer or a servant of somebody here? Why do you go out of the camp without getting my seal?” Siddhārtaka replied that he was a servant of minister Rākṣasa and was going out without the seal owing to the importance of the work. Bhāgurāyaṇa asked what that importance of work was which made him transgress the royal command, snatched the letter from his hand, and seeing it marked with Rākṣasa’s ring, opened and read it as follows: “Hail! Somebody from somewhere informs some one in his place: By repudiating our enemy, the truthful person has shown his truthfulness; and now, by giving what has been previously promised to these friends of ours with whom a pact has been previously arranged, the person of truthful promise must carry out his promise; and they too, being so propitiated, will uproot their previous support and serve you; though this is not forgotten, I remind the truthful person; among them, some desire the enemy’s treasure, some the elephants and still others, the territory; the three ornaments which were sent by the worthy person have been received; and I have also, as a compliment to the letter, sent something. The oral message is to be heard from Siddhārthaka who is one most reliable.” Bhāgurāyaṇa then asked Siddhārthaka “Siddhārthaka! Whose letter is this? By whom is the oral message to be heard from you?” Siddhārthaka evaded by saying that he knew nothing, and Bhāgurāyaṇa



had him beat by servants. As he was being beaten, the box of ornaments sealed with Rāksasa's ring fell from underneath his arm. Malayaketu decided that the box of ornaments might be the complement to the letter, opened it and saw the ornaments which he had taken out from his own body and presented to Rāksasa. Then, coming to the conclusion that the letter had been sent by Rāksasa to Malayaketu, he beat Siddhārthaka again and asked him to give out the oral message. Siddhārthaka fell at Malayaketu's feet and prayed for security. Malayaketu thereupon told him "Good man! There is certainly no danger to you, another's servant, but speak out the facts as they are." So asked by Malayaketu Siddhārthaka told everything. "Prince, Minister Rāksasa has given this letter and sent me to Candragupta, the oral message is that, of my five dear friends, Citravarman and the rest, two want the treasury and the elephants, the others desire the territory, therefore, just as I was favoured by dismissing Cānabha, His Majesty must give them also what has been already promised to them." On hearing this Malayaketu thought of the devotion of Citravarman and others towards Rāksasa, concluded that they too plotted against him, and sent a servant to fetch Rāksasa. On being called by Malayaketu, Rāksasa, having disposed of the ornament sent by Malayaketu, put on the ornaments purchased by him from Viśvāvasu and others, and came to Malayaketu. In his usual manner, Rāksasa informed Malayaketu the alignment of positions in the army made by him for the king, Citravarman

and the rest. On hearing that, Malayaketu came to the conclusion that the very persons, Citra varman and the rest, who were out to propitiate Candragupta by destroying him, were made to encircle him in the army, and asked Rāksasa 'Sir! does any one now go to Pātalipura or come from there?' Rāksasa said 'There is no need now for anybody to be going to and fro, in a few days, we are ourselves going there' Malayaketu asked 'If it is so, why have you, noble Sir, sent a letter to Pātalipura through Siddhārthaka?' Rāksasa exclaimed 'Siddhārthaka! what is it?' Siddhārthaka then said with tears 'Being beat, I told the secret.' Though Rāksasa asked him what the secret was like Siddhārthaka remained silent, with his head bent down. Remarking that in front of his master, Siddhārthaka would not, out of fear or shame, speak out, Bhāgurāyana himself said 'Siddhārthaka says that Minister Rāksasa gave a letter and an oral message and sent him to Chandragupta' Rāksasa heard it and observed 'Being beat he speaks falsehood, what will not a belaboured man say?'. Thereupon Malayaketu said 'Bhāgurāyana! if it is so, show Rāksasa the letter sealed with Rāksasa's ring' Rāksasa saw the letter and said that it was possible to forge the seal as well as the letter. Malayaketu then said 'These jewels were sent by you, noble Sir as a compliment to the letter, how could these too be deceitful?' Rāksasa replied 'These ornaments were not sent by me, but were given by me to Siddhārthaka as a present for some act' Bhāgurāyana said 'Prince! how could it be believed that

ornaments of such a nature removed from your own body and given by you were presented to such a person (as Siddhārthaka) ?', and he asked Siddhārthaka who wrote the letter Siddhārthaka looked at Rāksasa's face and stood silent and when he was beat again he said that Sakatadīsa wrote it Thereupon Rāksasa said that if Śakatadīsa had written it, it was as good as having been written by himself Bhāgurāyana said further that Sakatadīsa too would not accept in Rāksasa's presence that he himself wrote it and ordered a servant that a specimen of Sakatadīsa's writing and Rāksasa's ring be brought When the servants brought them, Rāksasa too saw the identity and concluded that it was Śakatadīsa himself who had joined the enemies and played that ruse Malayaketu then observed the three jewels of his father worn by Rāksasa and being certain that they were the three jewels mentioned in the letter and sent by Candragupta to Rāksasa, he asked Rāksasa 'Where were the three jewels got from?' "They were purchased from merchants" replied Rāksasa Malayaketu said 'Noble Sir! it is impossible that such ornaments which were worn by my father and which had, further, come to Candragupta were purchased from merchants" Rāksasa thereupon thought within himself "The enemy's strategem has been very conclusively laid for, I cannot reply that the letter is not mine, since the seal is mine, how is it to be believed that Sakatadīsa betrayed my friendship? Who will think it possible that King Candragupta sold ornaments? Therefore acceptance (of guilt) is

better, and not any ineffectual answer." Thinking thus, he remained silent. Malayaketu then told Rākṣasa "It is certain that having killed previously my father Parvatakeśvara, who had placed confidence in you, through the strategem of the poison-damsel, you are now endeavouring to do away with me also." When Rākṣasa denied that he did not direct the poison-damsel against Parvatakeśvara, they mentioned Jivasiddhi's name to him. Rākṣasa concluded that his very heart had been captured by the enemy and stood dispirited. Malayaketu then looked at Rākṣasa and told him "I am not a traitor like you; by all means, go and make peace with Candragupta; I can uproot Candragupta, Cānakya and you together." He then ordered Citravarman and others also, who out of friendliness towards Rākṣasa desired to harm Malayaketu, to be killed. They were accordingly put to death. Rākṣasa went out all alone and thought: "Shall I repair to the penance grove? This mind nursing enmity will not become quiet by penance. Shall I follow my masters? To do so while yet the enemy is not dead is to act like women. Or shall I, with sword as my ally, plunge into the enemy's army? This too is not proper; if it is not ungrateful, my heart that is impatient to free Candanadāsa would prevent me from doing so. Therefore, Candanadāsa, best of my friends who, for my sake, cares not for his own life, must somehow be freed." Having decided thus, Rākṣasa came secretly to the dilapidated garden at the outskirts of Pāṭalipura.

After that, as Malayaketu's allies had all been removed, Bhāgurāyaṇa, Bhadrabhāṭa and others who had spread themselves all over the army, thought it to be the best moment, restrained Malayaketu and captured him.

At this juncture, Rākṣasa saw in the old garden of Pāṭalipura a man sent by Cāṇakya, trying to put an end to himself, and asked him why he was committing suicide. The man did not tell at first, but as a result of Rākṣasa's pressure told with some hesitation : " There is in this city, the chief of the Jewellers, Candanadāsa by name, who is a great friend of Minister Rākṣasa ; there is a friend of his named Viṣṇudāsa ; that Viṣṇudāsa is a dear friend of mine and he has now left the city to immolate himself in fire ; thence counting the giving up of my life better than the bereavement of a friend, I began doing this." Informed thus by that man, Rākṣasa asked him " What is the reason for your friend Viṣṇudāsa endeavouring to put himself to death ?". Displaying his dislike at the delay caused to him, the man said " This friend of Candanadāsa, named Viṣṇudāsa, unable to bear the detention of his friend Candanadāsa on account of Rākṣasa, went to Candragupta and sought the release of Candanadāsa by a payment of money ; Candragupta told him that he had kept Candanadāsa under arrest not for the sake of money, but because Candanadāsa harboured the family of Rākṣasa and did not surrender them though entreated several times, and ordered a servant standing in front to put an end to Candanadāsa if he did not give up Minister

Rākṣasa's family; even then Candanadāsa did not, out of his love for his friend, surrender the family of Minister Rākṣasa; and Candanadāsa was taken to the place of execution; thereupon my dear friend Viṣṇudāsa decided to die earlier than his dear friend, and went out of the city." Thus informed by the man, Rākṣasa said "Have no fears; stop Viṣṇudāsa from entering the flames and I shall free Candanadāsa too from the fear of death." The man had some suspicion (that it might be Rākṣasa) and asked him who he was; Rākṣasa gave his name. The man told Rākṣasa "Previously, one Śakaṭadāsa was taken to the place of execution on the behest of Candragupta, but Śakaṭadāsa was spirited away to a different part of the country by somebody; upon that, Candragupta, who did not tolerate the transgression of his order, had all the executioners put to death; from that time, all the executioners remain alert and carry out their duty; you must therefore be quick." Listening to such words from that man, Rākṣasa wondered at the intellectual efficiency of Cāṇakya and thought: "This is not the proper time for the sword as the executioners had once been previously put to death (for negligence); a strategic move brings forth its fruit in a distant future and of what use is it here? Indifference is not proper when my dear friend is in a terrible danger which is of my own making; well, I shall make this body of mine a recompense for this." Resolving therefore that he must rush soon to Candanadāsa's side, Rākṣasa came to the spot where Candanadāsa had been brought for execution

whose endowments, we, his envious rivals, are not glad." On seeing Rākṣasa, Cāṇakya bowed to him with regard, and Rākṣasa said that Cāṇakya ought not to touch him, polluted as he was by the touch of the executioners. Hearing that, Cāṇakya informed Rākṣasa all the plans laid by him so that Rākṣasa might believe them. Cāṇakya said "Minister Rākṣasa I these two are not untouchable executioners; but one is Siddhārthaka whom you have seen previously; and the other also is one in royal service named Samiddhārthaka; Śakatadāsa too is by himself innocent and he was made to write that treacherous letter by me; this is an epitome of this matter: The servants Bhadrabhaṭa and others, that kind of letter, Samiddhārthaka, these three ornaments, your friend who appeared to be a Jain monk, this man in the old garden, the suffering of the merchant Candanadāsa, all these, O! heroic man, are the manoeuvres employed by me who desired your alliance with Candragupta. And here is Candragupta desirous of meeting you." On hearing this, Rākṣasa had his suspicion about Śakatadāsa removed and though he did not agree to see Candragupta, he accepted to do so under pressure (of circumstances). Candragupta became aware of the happenings and was pleased at heart; greatly wondering at the adeptness of Cāṇakya in political strategy, Candragupta came forth with his retinue and made obeisance to Cāṇakya. Cāṇakya thereupon told Candragupta "This is your hereditary minister, Rākṣasa, salute him", and Candragupta did accordingly. Having given his blessings, Rākṣasa thought within himself

thus "Even a fool of a minister is sure to be established in a position of fame by resorting to a proper and successful person, by resorting to an unworthy person, even the minister whose policies are faultless falls to the ground by the decay of his foundation, like a tree on the river bank'

Cānākya asked Rāksasa if he desired Candanadāsa to live, and Rāksasa replied "What doubt is there? Undoubtedly I desire that Candanadāsa should be alive, it is only for that that I have come' Cānākya said 'If Candanadāsa should live, take the sword, the emblem of the minister, if you do not take it, Candanadāsa is dead" On hearing these words of Cānākya, Rāksasa, who was swayed by his friendship towards his benefactor Candanadāsa, reluctantly accepted the ministerial sword. Having achieved his purpose, Cānākya was immensely satisfied and Candragupta too considered himself as having realised his object. Then a man came and informed Cānākya that Malayaketu, with his hands and feet bound, had been brought to the doorway there by Bhadrabhata, Bhāgurāyana and others, Cānākya told the man "I am not the minister now, Rāksasa is the minister, inform him' Told accordingly by the man, Rāksasa represented to Candragupta "King Candragupta! I had lived for sometime in Malayaketu's camp, therefore, for my sake, you must protect Malayaketu' So told, Candragupta looked at Cānākya, and Cānākya, for the sake of Rāksasa's satisfaction, told the man "On the representation made by the Minister, Rāksasa, King Candragupta grants Malayaketu his paternal



kingdom, let Malayaketu therefore go to his own country, let Bhadrabhata and others accompany him and return after establishing him in his kingdom. As the man was taking that message and going away Cānakya ordered him again 'Tell the Commander of the Forts, Vijaya, that the merchant Candanadāsa be made the head of all the jewellers in all the cities in the country, so does Candragupta command out of his affection for Rāksasa. Again, Cānakya told the man as he left with that message 'Except the elephants, let everything else in bonds be released, having carried out my vow I tie up my tuft. Ordered thus, Bhadrabhata and others departed with Malayaketu, Candanadāsa was made the chief of the jewellers community, and, after making the king suitably honour all those who had helped them previously, Canakya left for the forest to practice austerities. Rāksasa became united with his wife, son and others, and lived happily, shouldering the ministerial responsibility and seeking the increasing good of the king. King Candragupta too as the emperor over all, protected the earth girdled by the four seas.

---

## V

### Other Versions of the Story

The slight differences between this account of Mahādeva and the account of Ravi Nartaka have already been set forth, and it has also been pointed out that these two versions of Mahādeva and Ravi, agree on the major facts of the story. Similarly,

the version given by Dhuudhi as a perface to his commentary on the drama is also not different from Mahādeva's

### V-(a-1)

#### Jagaddhara's Version

Jagaddhara, the well-known scholiast on the dramas (A D 1300-1400)<sup>12</sup>, has written a commentary on the Mudrārāksasa also, and a manuscript of it is available in the Madras Government Oriental Mss Library (R No 3768) His commentary opens with a short gist of the previous story which is as follows <sup>13</sup>

In the Somavamśa, there was the king Nanda who had his chief minister in Sakatāra. Once two Brahmans came to their capital with a desire to get money, and they were adepts in the art of entering others bodies. The King died of illness but soon his body got re-animated by one of these two Brahmans. The new re-animated king was not only free from the illness which proved fatal but was also very liberal. Sakatāra got suspicious on noticing this and ordered that if any dead body was seen anywhere outside the city, it must be burnt. The Brahman who had to remain in the King's body developed a dislike for Sakatāra who

12 See P. K. Gode Date of Jagaddhara J of the Bom Uni IX. 2 1940 pp 116-125

13 I am thankful to Dr A. Sankaran Curator for supplying me with a copy of this introductory note in Jagaddhara's glo. a. The Sanskrit of this introduction is not good enough for Jagaddhara.

had burnt his body, and as a vengeance, he destroyed all the relations and associates of Śakaṭāra, thus leaving Śakaṭāra alone. Once the king saw a fruit of the Banyan tree being borne by urin and smiled, upon which a woman who was there smiled too. The King asked her if she knew why he had smiled and said that if she did not give the cause of his smile in two or three days, he would punish her. She went to Śakaṭāra who was an adept in divining others' minds and asked him. Śakaṭāra who was in deep grief at his bereavement asked her the circumstances of the smile, and explained to the woman that the King smiled at the fact that the fruit of such a huge tree as the Banyan was carried away by urin. The woman came to the King and told him the cause of his smile. The King however did not believe her to be capable of that intuition, and quite certain that Śakaṭāra must have solved the mystery for her, sent for him and made him his minister again.

After some time, Śakaṭāra, who did not forget the king's previous enmity, decided that he would bring an ugly Brahman boy and have the King uprooted. The King asked Śakaṭāra to find a Brahman for his father's Śrāddha. Śakaṭāra saw Cāṇakya pouring buttermilk to destroy the roots of some grass that had pricked his feet: Śakaṭāra found him also to be very ugly and very ingenious in brain and resolved to take him to the palace for the Śrāddha. He thought that if the King saw such a person and sent him out, Cāṇakya would become inimical, and with his crooked intellect, uproot the king. Things happened as Śakaṭāra

thought and Cānakya swore that he would tie up his tuft after uprooting the king. Having managed to set a powerful enemy against the king, Sakatāra retired to the forest to do penance.

Cānakya wanted to secure the kingdom for Candragupta whom Jagaddhara mentions as the brother-in-law of Nanda. The opposite side is represented by Rāksasa trying to install Malayaketu, son of Parvatakeśvara, on the throne. Rāksasa who is not previously mentioned is abruptly introduced here<sup>14</sup>

14 Extract from Jagaddhara's Commentary on the Mudra rāksasa (R. 3768 Madras Govt. Ori. Mss. Library)

इह सप्तु सोमवश नन्दा नाम राजा बभूव । तस्य च महामन्त्री शकटारो बभूव । अथ देशान्तरादर्धाधिनी द्वी परपुरप्रवेशकुशलौ ब्राह्मणा तनगरीमागतौ । तत कदाचिन् मरणशरणे नन्दे तयोरेकेन स्वशरोरे नगरबहिरवस्थाप्य नन्दशरोरे प्रवेश कृत । अथ स शकटारः कथमतिरोगवानपि निस्तीर्णो राजा, पृथुदशत भतिदशदानादिगुणवान्, ततोऽन्विन्यता नगराद् बहिः भुतक दशतां च तदित्यादिश्वान् । आदेशकारेणा च तच्छरीरे नगरबहिरेव दग्धे तस्यावस्थिति नन्दशरार एव वृत्ता । अथ तन नन्दवेपथारिणा राज्ञा राज्य पाटन दनदिक च धृतम् । अथ शकटारेण मम शरारं नाशितम् अतस्त्वमपि समूलमुन्मूलयिष्यामीति मनसि कृत्वा शकटारनाह्वयवक्षिष्टम् (?) अन्ये तदुग्रा विनाशिता । तत कदाचिन् नन्देन मूलत्वात्तदमरे स्मृत्प्रवाहे लब्धमन पटवृक्ष फलनलोक्य दक्षितम् । तददलोक्य कदापि नार्पा तत्रत्यया दक्षितम् । अथ 'त्व कुतो हन्तिताम' इति नन्दनृपेऽन्ना पृथ च नास्ति दक्षिता । ततो नदि द्वित्रिदन्त्यन्तरे त्वया नास्ति दक्षितं, तदा तव शक्ति कारव्ये इति नन्देन मादृश । परमनाजिघ्र शकटारमनुस्मृत्य प्राणनाशितत्वाति- दुन्दग्धस्य शकटारस्य स्थान प्रश्नयन् त्वं स पृच्छति स्म महामन्त्रिन् ! तदा उतो राज्ञा दक्षितमिति । अथ शकटारः सा अवसर पृथ । तत्र तत्रम्—

It may be noted that this account has much in common with that of Ananta Bhatta set forth below. Ananta Bhatta was later than Jagaddhara

### V-(a-2).

A version in a Trivandrum Ms of the Drama

In manuscript No 1559 in the Maharajah's Palace Library, Trivandrum, representing a copy of the Mudārāksasa Nāṭaka, we have a postscript

तच्छुत्वा शक्यारोच (-र आह) इमा-कथम् (कथ) इदं दृष्टफलमिति शक्यं ल  
मिदमिच्छामिपि ईदृशे लघुनि मूलप्रवहेत्कथ इति ननसि निवाय राज्ञा हसितमिति ।  
अपेक्षनाकर्म तया राजस्थानमागत्य देवदेवस्त्वेदं हासनिमित्तमिति कथितम् ।  
ततो राज्ञा परमनोज्ञता मस्या न समवति, शक्यार एव परमाग्रे कथं  
समम् इत्युक्त्वा शक्यार प्रशस्य तन्निष्पन्नार्थाय च निजमन्त्रिपदे अभिषिक्तवान् ।  
ततः कियता कालेन पूर्ववैरमनुसृत्य शक्यारेण विविद्वद्विदं (हुँय ?) बद्धु  
नानान एनं समूलमुन्मूलयामाति चिन्तितम् । तत्रान्तरे राज्ञा महीयपितृधाम्नाय  
पात्रं प्राप्य कमप्यानीय देहीनि शक्यारे नियुक्ते, चाणक्यस्य (?) पदतलं  
कुताङ्कुरेण धत्तमिति रोपेण कुशमूलं नारप्यार्थं तत्र ददानं चाणक्यमति-  
तुर्दर्शनमतिकुटिलमतिनवलाक्यं अमुनेव पत्रदत्तं राजकुलं नयामाति,  
यद्येनमाश्रमलाक्य राजा बहिः कारयेत् तदा बद्धवरोऽयं कुतुभिः तं समूलघात  
हनिष्यताति मत्तं शक्यारेण चाणक्यं पात्रागमाहूत । धादप्याने प्रवेशितश्च ।  
ततो राज्ञा पुन एष कुक्षो निपिद्ध इति बहिः कारितः । ततः चाणक्येन निनधपय-  
नवात्यं नन्दवत्प्रतिज्ञातम् । तद्व्यपयन्तं च शिवा मुक्ता । तत्रान्तरे शक्यार-  
मन्त्रा जिनन्दिनपत्तलपु वनं जगाम । चाणक्येन गर्भगणनवन्द्या नात्रिताः  
(नगिता) चन्द्रशुभाय नन्दस्याल्लभ्यं राज्यं दातुमारब्ध इत्येकं पक्षः । अपरस्तु  
मन्त्रिराक्षसेन नल्यकेतुः पूर्वतद्वरपुत्रो राज्यं मया अभिषेक्य इति प्रतिज्ञाय  
तद्वृत्तिं विधातुमारब्धमिति कथावचनं वस्तुनिर्दशत्वनं कटाक्षयन् अक्षयदा  
नन्दा—॥

## V-(a-3).

## Ananta Bhaṭṭa's Version

Ananta Bhaṭṭa's version of the Pūrvapiṭhikā has many differences<sup>16</sup>. King Nanda, Sudhanvan by name, had nine sons, Udagradhanvan, Tīkṣṇadhanvan etc. through his chief queen Ratnāvali, and a son named Candragupta through a Dāsi. Candragupta was very precocious and consequently aroused his brothers' jealousy and suspicion. Once King Nanda went to the park to witness a festival, and was accompanied by a female chowrie-bearer named Sumaṅgalā. The King stopped under a Banyan tree and after a while suddenly smiled; seeing the king smile, the attendant also smiled. On seeing her also smile, the King ordered that she must find out within a day why he, the King, smiled and if she failed to do so, her life would be in danger. The poor attendant became desperate and went to the river that night to commit suicide. There she met a Brahman who enquired of the cause of her despair and when she told him that the circumstances of the king's smile were that the king was resting under a Banyan tree, and there was a row of ants carrying berries, the Brahman explained that the king, on seeing the small berries carried by the ants, thought of the Banyan tree, too big for even elephants to shake, which would grow out of them, and smiled. Sumaṅgalā told the king

16 See description in No 1654, R. L. Mitra's Notices, Vol. IV. The information here is supplemented by details supplied by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja from the Bikaner Ms. and the summary given in Jivananda Vidyasagar's edition of the Drama.

why he smiled, and immensely pleased with her intuition, the king rewarded her. Sometime afterwards some enemy kings who wanted to attack Nanda desired to know the intellectual strength of Nanda and his ministers, and sent Nanda a small stick of Devadāru asking him to find out which end of the rod was the base and which the top. Neither Nanda nor his ministers were equal to this task. The King asked Sumangalā if she could again apply her ingenuity to this problem. She said that, even on the last occasion it was not herself but an old Brahman named Subuddhiśarma on the river bank who found out the cause of the smile, and that she would try if the Brahman was there. She went to the Brahman told him the problem awaiting solution and brought him to the palace. The Brahman found out the base and top of the rod by throwing it into water. The King, greatly pleased with the Brahman who revealed himself as a protege of the merchant Candanadāsa, made him his minister and friend. He then came to be known as Rāksasa owing to his fearless fighting.

Not long afterwards, the King passed away; but as his body was about to be cremated, it got re-animated. A certain recluse named Suvidya, previously a forest chief of the Vindhya region came to Kuśmapura with two pupils, Suśila and Bahuśruta, to find the money for paying fees to his teacher Nilakantha of Nepal. He was a Yogi who knew the art of entering another's body. Instructing one pupil to watch over his body till his return and another to approach him for riches in the

evening, Suvidya entered the King's body. Soon after this the re-animated King was approached by the pupil for a gift of money and the King granted. Rākṣasa, who was watching all this, suspected the trick of *Para-kāya-praveśa*, and went out on horse to find out if the body of the person who had entered the King's was to be seen anywhere. He found the body in the custody of two pupils, one of whom he had seen in the palace asking money of the King. Rākṣasa had the body cremated and the two pupils were thrown into the Ganges. Suvidya came to know of this, and mortified at the necessity to continue in the King's body, began to loathe Rākṣasa and favour minister Vakranāsa. Rākṣasa left the King and became the minister of Parvateśvara. A minister of the Nanda named Śakatūra had been in charge of the camp near the dominions of Parvatakeśvara; when he heard that one Subuddhi had become Nanda's minister, he left his camp duty and returned to the capital to be near the King.

Once the fake Nanda and this minister of his named Śakatūra went for a hunt and being tired and thirsty, they rested under a tree. The King asked the minister to bring some water, and when the minister reached a lake nearby, he saw in it a slab with two verses<sup>17</sup> incised, saying that

17. (1) अत्युद्धृते मन्त्रिणि पार्श्वे च etc., same as *Mudrā-rākṣasa* IV. 13.

(2) तुल्यार्थं तुल्यसामर्थ्यं मर्मज्ञं व्यसयिणम् ।

अर्थराज्यहरं मूल्यं यो न हन्यात् स हन्यते ॥



royal power could not balance itself on two, a King and a powerful minister, and that one had to be killed. The minister did not want the king to see the verses, and so turned the stone upside down. But the king also came there and as he was about to turn the slab over, the minister dropped a stone on the king and killed him. He hid the King's body under the slab, returned and reported that the King was lost in the hunt. Udagradhanvan, the eldest son of the real Nanda, was coronated.

One day, Udagradhanvan, while playing polo, noted the love of a bird towards its young one, and became very eager to know how exactly the late King was lost. He ordered that spies should bring information about it in three days. A spy, Karunākara by name, came upon a Tīntrika who raised the goddess Bhadrakālī in a dead body and through her, got the entire story of how Sakaṭāra put an end to the King in the forest. Then, on the orders of the King Sakaṭāra and his wife and his six sons Sankaṭavarman, Vikāṭavarman, Sumati, Mitragupta, Prakāṭāra and Vikāṭāra were thrown into a cellar with a small supply of food and water. All of them perished except one son named Vikāṭāra. Meantime, Rākṣasa took leave of Pārvata-keśvara and came back to Kusūmapura and the King took him as minister. Taking pity on young Vikāṭāra the King and Rākṣasa released him. Rākṣasa enjoined upon Vikāṭāra the duty of inviting Brahmans for Śrīddhi. Vikāṭāra met the eighty year old, ugly Viṣṇugupta, son of Śivagupta, who was angrily throwing sugar at

the roots of a stump of grass so that ants might gather and destroy its roots. On being questioned by Vikaṭāra, Viṣṇugupta said that his father, while going for bath had his foot pricked by grass and died, and that therefore, he was extirpating all grass from the face of the earth. Seeing that this Viṣṇugupta was of very hideous appearance and thinking that the King would certainly insult him by sending him away, and that very irate as he was, Viṣṇugupta would take vengeance on the King, Vikaṭāra who was nursing his grievance against the king, invited Viṣṇugupta to the Śrāddha. Viṣṇugupta went and was removed from his seat ; and with his tuft loose, he swore he would uproot the Nandas. We do not hear of Vikaṭāra any more. Cāṇakya called out whether any one was desirous of the kingdom. Maurya Candragupta, a son of Nanda Sudhanvan, along with Rājasena, Bhāgurāyaṇa, and others, followed Viṣṇugupta. They sought the alliance of Parvatakeśvara a student of Cāṇakya's work on polity, and besieged Kusumapura. Parvatakeśvara was promised half the kingdom. In the battle, the Nandas were killed and Candragupta obtained Kusumapura. Sarvārthasiddhi, who is mentioned as the King's paternal uncle's son, went away to the forest. Rākṣasa conspired with Parvatakeśvara and sent a poison-damsel against Candragupta but Cāṇakya saw to it that Parvatakeśvara was killed by the poison-damsel.

#### V-(a-4)

Another Version in a Bikaner Ms.

In the anonymous version in the other Bikaner Library Manuscript, three Kṣatriya queens bearing

three sons each and a non-Ksatriya wife bearing Candragupta are mentioned, in the manner of the note at the end of a Trivandrum manuscript of the play mentioned above Citrasena of the Sūryavamśa and the Nandānvaya ruled at Pātali-putra. He had two queens, Sumati and Rambhāvatī, by the first, the king had the son Virasena, and by the second Sarvārthasiddhi. The latter retired to the forest and Virasena succeeded to the throne. Virasena had three queens Mādri, Māgadhi and Cardyā, the first gave birth to the sons Śūrasena, Satyavrata and Śrutadhvaṇa, the second to Nala, Karna and Bhīma, and the third to Rāma, Hariscandra and Dirghāyus, another a South Indian princess kept as a Dāsī by the king, gave birth to Candragupta.

Virasena had three ministers Vairocana, Vahraṇāsa and Rāḥṣasa.

In the course of his conquests, Virasena vanquished a Yavana king called Mahākāya of the Pārasika country and made him his subordinate. He is also referred to as Parvateśvara and his son is mentioned as Malayaketu.

The incident of the hunt, the king's thirst, the slab with two verses lying in the pond—all this is given as in the Ananta Bhatṭa version with the difference that the minister figuring in the incident here is given as Vairocana.

Śūrasena, the eldest son, succeeded Candragupta, the late King's last son by the Śūdra mistress, became jealous, and came to a pact with the Yavana king to do away with Śūrasena. A

shepherd from the forest who was an eye-witness to the murder of the late King by Virasena came to the Capital for the Dipotsava and the Gokriḍā, and through a kinsman of his, informed King Śūrasena of the whole incident. Śūrasena thereupon favoured Rākṣasa and was thinking of some means to kill Vairocana. He himself went to the forest pond and verified the truth of the shepherd's account. Vairocana and his family were thrown into a prison with a meagre ration of food and drink. Leaving the last son, the rest of the family perished.

Sometime afterwards, as an act of merit during his illness, the king released Vairocana's boy. The famished boy was treated, fed and entrusted first with the garden, then with Dānādhikāra and then with Bhojanādhikāra. Asked once to invite Brāhmins for the New Moon day, he brought an old Naiṣṭhika Brahmacārin, ugly, irate, and engaged in pouring gruel at the dug-out roots of grass. The story then follows as in the other versions; in the battle for Kusumapura, Cānakya is said to have used incantations, Mantras<sup>18</sup>

### V-(a-5).

#### One More Version.

In a Bengal edition of 1922 from Nakipur of the Mudrārākṣasa published with a commentary by Haridāsa Siddhāntavāgīśaḥṭṭācārya, we are given the following story: The Sūdra King Mahāpadma Nanda had nine sons named Nandas

18 Details supplied by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja.

by queen Ratnavah and one son named Candragupta Maurya by a barber woman named Murā Candragupta Maurya was the eldest and the best son but he was held in contempt by his brothers Mahāpadma Nanda had a cousin named Viśvaketu whom he appointed governor of a North Western province of his Viśvaketu's son Malayaketu was staying in Pāṭaliputra Mahāpadma had three ministers Rakṣasa Vakranāsa and Śakatāra For burning a live man under the mistake of a corpse, Śakatāra was punished by the king by being confined with family in an underground cellar with a little ration of food and water While his family perished Śakatāra managed to live the king took pity on him rescued him and made him a minister again Once Śaknāra met the ugly Cāṇakya, a scholar from Takṣaśilī pouring butter milk at the root of the grass that had pricked him on the eve of his marriage and impeded the function Cāṇakya was so angry that he was doing so to destroy the grass completely Finding him to be irascible enough to take terrible vengeance and ugly enough to be insulted by the king Vikāra invited Cāṇakya to the Śrīddha at the palace There Cāṇakya was as expected insulted by the king and he swore that he would tie his tuft after destroying the Nandas Cāṇakya called out for the person who wanted the kingdom and Candragupta presented himself Some other persons Bhadrabhaṭṭa etc joined the two and they sought Parvatakeśvara's alliance Cāṇakya practiced a black rite as a result of which the Nandas perished after six months from then

## V-(a-6)

From quotations in the commentary of Abhinavagupta on the Nāṭyaśāstra, the Abhinavabhāratī<sup>19</sup>, we come to know that we had, besides Viśākhadatta's Mudrārāśasa, another important drama on the same story of Cānakya's Vow named Pratijñācānakya composed by Mahākavi Bhīma. From one of the citations made by Abhinavagupta, we glean that corresponding to Malayaketu we had in this drama of Bhīma the character Vindhyaetu, dealt with as a Sakāra<sup>20</sup>. If this drama comes to light, it may explain some of the threads in the varying versions of the story noticed above.

## V-(b-1).

## The Puranic Version

The Śiśunūgas ruled over Magadha, of these Udayi founded Kusumapura on the southern bank of the Ganges, they were followed by the Nandas, the first Nanda king was Mahāpadma, born to Mahānandī, the last Śiśunūga by a Śūdrā woman, hence forth the kings were Śūdras; Mahāpadma became the supreme sovereign, having put down other Kṣatriya kings, he was followed by his nine sons, the eldest of whom was Sukalpa or Sumālīya, they were all uprooted by Kautīlīya, the Mauryas then came to power

---

19 Gaek. edn. part 2, pp 161-162

20 A character like the Rāṣṭrīya Rajasyala Samsthānaka in the Mṛcchakaṭīka of Śūdraka.

Candragupta, the founder of the Maurya line was anointed by Kautilya

[See *The Purana Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age* F E Pargiter]

## V-(b-2)

### The Brhatkathā Version

as preserved by Ksemendra and Somadeva

The story of Pātaliputra Nanda and Candragupta are told in I ii of Ksemendra's Brhatkathā-mañjarī (*Kayamala* edn) and in I iii-v of Somadeva's Kathāsaritsāgara (*N S Press* edn)

Vararuci narrates the stories of the foundation of Pātaliputra, of himself Indradatta and Vyādi prosecuting their studies there of Indradatta becoming Yoga Nanda and of Cānakya uprooting him for minister Sakatāla's sake and placing Candragupta on the throne

Pāṭali was a princess and Putraka was a Brahman youth blessed by God Kumāra with vast riches and the fortune of future royalty Once as they were sporting themselves in air with the help of a miraculous aid which Putraka had, they descended at a place on the Ganges which they marked off and built into a city named after themselves as Pāṭaliputraka.

Here Vararuci, Indradatta and Vyādi came to Varṣa and Upavarṣa for study Nanda was king of Pāṭaliputra when these scholars came there On the conclusion of their studies they had to pay

one crore as teachers' fees (Gurudakṣiṇā) to Varṣa and whom else could they approach for such a huge sum except King Nanda, the lord of ninety-nine crores? *Nanda was camping at Benares* at that time, but just when they reached the royal camp, the king had expired. Immediately, Indradatta resorted to his Yogic power enabling him to leave his body and enter another's (*Para-kāya-praveśa*), left his body in Vyāḍi's care and entered the dead Nanda's body. This re-animated Nanda King was Yoga Nanda and to him Vararuci applied for a crore of money for Gurudakṣiṇā. Yoga Nanda ordered the minister Śakaṭāla to give the amount, but Śakaṭāla, the sbrewd minister, guessed the true state of affairs when he thought about the surprising sequence of death, sudden re-animation and immediate application for money. Śakaṭāla wanted to mark time, *as the late real Nanda's son was but a boy at that time*; he however ordered all the corpses that could be found to be assigned to fire and consequently Indradatta's body in Vyāḍi's charge was also forcibly taken and burnt. Vyāḍi informed his friend in Nanda's body of this and Indradatta was sorry he had to inhabit permanently a *Śūdra's* body (I. iv. 114). Vyāḍi told Indradatta that his person was not safe at the hands of Śakaṭāla who had seen through their trick and that Indradatta had better take Vararuci as his minister. Indradatta or Yoga Nanda acted upon Vyāḍi's advice, made Vararuci his minister and *threw Śakaṭāla and his hundred sons into an empty well* with a daily supply of food and water sufficient for only one person.



Śakatāla wanted to avenge the wrong done to him, and his sons offered to die, allowing their father to sustain his life by the food and water daily sent down so that he might take revenge upon Yoga Nanda. *All this happened at the Benares camp.* Yoga Nanda the king and Vararuci the minister returned to Pātaliputra. The Ganges whom Vararuci propitiated was pleased to place at Vararuci's disposal a daily gift of gold. Mad with power Yoga Nanda now became a prey to lust and Vararuci thought of Śakatāla and had him rescued from the well and brought back as a minister. Nursing inwardly his grudge Śakatāla carried on his ministerial duties. Vararuci gave more than one exhibition of his intuitive powers in one of which he intuitively marked a mole at the wrist of the queen. Yoga Nanda thereupon began to suspect the character of his queen and Vararuci and ordered Vararuci's execution. Śakatāla however in view of the good turn done to him by Vararuci and in view of Vararuci's great powers kept him hid in his own house and had some one else executed in his stead. Confidence grew between Vararuci and Śakatāla now and the former told Śakatāla that thanks to a Rakṣasa whom he had rendered subservient to himself none could kill him. Vararuci showed to Śakatāla not only the Rakṣasa but also the goddess Ganges.

Yoga Nanda had a son named Hiranyagupta who had become mad owing to an act of ingratitude against a bear. This cause of his son's madness, Yoga Nanda could not know and exclaimed in his despair that were Vararuci alive, he would

tell him the cause at once. Śakaṭāla seized upon the opportunity to reveal the fact that he had kept Vararuci alive and brought him to the king. Vararuci narrated to the king the cause of his son's madness and added that this, as well as the queen's secret mole, he had known by intuition. The king was stricken with remorse for the treatment he had given to Vararuci, but the latter, who was, by this time, fed up with life, retired for penance.

As Yoga Nanda's wise guardian, Vararuci, was now away once for all, Śakaṭāla found it best time to wreak his vengeance on Yoga Nanda. He once found a Brāhman named Cāṇakya uprooting a stump of grass that had hurt his foot and thought that he was the person who could be made angry enough to uproot Yoga Nanda. Śakaṭāla persuaded Cāṇakya to attend a Śrāddha at the palace and accept a lakh of gold as fees. Cāṇakya agreed and went to the palace. There was another Brāhman named Subandhu whom the king preferred for the first seat. This led to Cāṇakya being insulted, and Cāṇakya untied his tuft and swore that he would do away with Yoga Nanda in a week. To that end, he raised an evil spirit and Yoga Nanda died. Śakaṭāla then killed Hiranyagupta, *crowned Candragupta the son of the real Nanda* as the king, made Cāṇakya his minister and retired for penance<sup>51</sup>

---

21 According to this version, 1. The Nanda king was a Śūdra and Candragupta was his own son, 2. The kings who had to be killed for making Candragupta the king were a fake

## V-(b-3)

## The Buddhistic Versions

The Ceylonese Buddhistic chronicle *Mahāvamsa* and its *Tikā* supply us with an account of Candragupta and Cānakya which has been summarised by G. Turnour in the introduction to his edition and translation of the *Mahāvamsa* (pp. xxxviii-xlii)<sup>22</sup> The *Tikā* says that a full account of this story is preserved in the *Atthakathā* of the priests of the *Uttaravihāra*.

Kālāsoka son and successor of Sāsūnīga, had ten sons nine of them being called the 'Nava Nandas' as a result of their bearing the word Nanda as part of their names. The eldest of these was on his mother's side of inferior descent and he was living in one of the provinces of the kingdom. He joined a band of free-booters and induced his brothers also to join the gang. Sometime afterwards the brothers decided to give up that life and aspire for sovereignty and having subdued some provincial towns they attacked Pāṭaliputra and usurped the throne. The nine Nandas ruled one after another in the order of seniority, for a

---

Nanda and his young son *Hiranyagupta*. 3 *Cāpakya* killed the king through black magic. 4 the old minister Śakaṭāla's grudge against the usurper Yoga Nanda was the motive force and 5 *Cāpakya's* bother to bring round a minister Rakṣasa which is his preoccupation in the play *Mudrarākṣasa* has no place in this story.

<sup>22</sup> See also Max Müller *Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 281ff.

total period of twenty-two years. The last of them was called Dhana Nanda as he developed a passion to hoard wealth by levying numerous taxes. He collected eighty crores and hid them in the cave of a rock underneath the river-bed of the Ganges.

While yet the Buddha was alive, some Sākya clans were driven to the Himalayas by king Vidhudhabo and they settled in a place which was full of peacocks (mayuras), from this place, the clan took the name Moriya.

There was at Taxila a Brāhman named Cānakya who was well versed in the Vedas, Mantras, strategems, polity etc and was capable of wielding the sceptre. His father had passed away and his mother pointed out to him that his teeth had indications of his coming royalty and that so far as she was concerned, she did not think happily of his becoming a king. Preferring his mother's love to sovereignty, Cānakya smashed his own teeth and added more ugliness to his already uncomely appearance.

Dhana Nanda of Puspapura (Puspapura or Patalipura) had now given up his gold lust and had taken to making charitable gifts, he had built an alms hall in which he had begun to honour the most eminent Brahman with a hundred crores and a most junior Brāhman with a lakh. Cānakya came to Puspapura for disputation and sat on the seat intended for the Chief Brahman. Dhana Nanda came into the Hall and seeing Cānakya in the Chief Brahman's seat, ordered him to be removed. Cānakya, whom the servants asked to go

away, rose up in anger, tore up his Brahmanical sacred thread, cast off his garment and assuming the character of an Ājīvaka, escaped Nanda's anger and hid himself

In the retinue of Dhana Nanda himself was a prince called Pabbato (Parvatakeśvara) and to him Cāṇakya went in the night to win him over to his own side by giving him promise of sovereignty. Pabbato agreed and then Cāṇakya and the prince escaped to the Vindhya. By re-minting the Kārṣāpna coins, he made up eighty crores of coin; searching again for a second individual whom he could raise to the throne, he came upon Candagutto (Candragupta) of the Moriya dynasty.

When Candragupta was yet in the womb, a neighbouring prince had attacked his father and killed him; the pregnant queen took shelter in Puppapura where she gave birth to a child near a cattle pen. A bull named Candra guarded the child and gave him the name Candragupta. As a boy, Candragupta was playing a game of royalty, himself playing the king. Cāṇakya who was in search of a potential sovereign found this boy Candragupta answering to his needs and purchased him for a thousand Kārṣāpṇas. Cāṇakya invested both Parvata and Candragupta with a gold twisted woollen thread round the neck worth a lakh.

Once both the princes had a dream which they secretly communicated to Cāṇakya from which Cāṇakya understood that Candragupta and not Parvata would attain sovereignty. On a certain

day the three were asleep under a tree; Cāṇakya woke up first and then Parvata; Cāṇakya, wishing to test the qualifications of the two, gave Parvata a sword and asked him to bring the thread round Candragupta's neck without cutting it. Parvata could not do so. On another day, Cāṇakya ordered Candragupta to do so while Parvata was asleep; finding that the only way to secure the thread without cutting it was to cut off the head, Candragupta slew Parvata and brought Cāṇakya the thread. Cāṇakya was satisfied with Candragupta's capacity and taught him everything in seven years. When Candragupta came of age, Cāṇakya brought out his hidden treasure and with that gathered an army for Candragupta. Candragupta and Cāṇakya began attacking towns and villages, but they failed to succeed. They then gave up fighting and began studying the mind of the people. Once, as the two were wandering, a woman was giving some cakes to her child who left off the edges of the cake and ate its centre; the woman remarked that the child was foolish like Candragupta who attacked the centre without reducing the frontiers. Cāṇakya and Candragupta took lesson from this remark, gathered their army and began capturing the frontiers and the provinces. After capturing these, they easily attacked Pāṭaliputra, killed Dhana Nanda and seized the throne.

Without immediately anointing Candragupta as King, Cāṇakya caught hold of a fisherman and sought his help to find out the treasure that Nanda had hidden in the Ganges. The

fisherman was promised kingship but after his successful discovery of the treasure he was put to death and Candragupta was made monarch

The Tika then speaks of the restoration of order in Candragupta's dominion by a Jatila or recluse called Manyatapas of the clever Canakya devising a gradual programme of poisoned food to make Candragupta's constitution poison proof and of Canakya's still more wonderful obstetric feat by which he brought into full life the fetus of Bindusara removed from the womb of Candragupta's dead queen and reared by stages in the wombs of different goats

The Tika adds that the re animation of a king's corpse that took place does not refer to Nanda as the Brahmanical books say but to Candragupta himself a Yakṣa named Devagarbha re animated Candragupta's corpse but on the discovery of this trick by the Brahman Purohita Bindusara put the Yakṣa to death

Besides this source the *Mahaparinibbana Sutta* also speaks of the Moriyas of Pippalivana (*Sacred Books of the East*, xi pp 134-5)

The Milinda Panho refers to the great battle between the Nandas on the one side and Candragupta and Cīnakya on the other it is said here that the Nanda Army was commanded by one Bhadrāsala and that immense number of infantry horses elephants and chariots perished in this war (*Sacred Books of the East* xxxvi pp 147-8)

The Buddhistic work *Arya Mañjuśrī mūlakalpa* also has the following references to Nanda, Candragupta and Cāṇakya. After king Śūrasena, Nanda became king of Puṣpapura; he had a huge army and was very powerful; he was originally a minister of Śūrasena, practised some Mantra whereby he amassed huge riches and usurped the throne; under Nanda there was a Brahmanical revival and Nanda gave much to the Brahman Tārṅikas of Magadha; the Buddhistic work therefore calls Nanda a *Nicamukhyatama*; his minister was the great Brahman named Vararuci; Nanda then estranged his ministers, fell ill and died; he ruled for sixty-six years; Pāṇini the Brāhman was also a friend of Nanda; Nanda was followed by Candragupta, a non-Buddhist who consequently died at midnight, placing his young son Bindusāra on the throne; Cāṇakya was his great minister, but he was a very angry man; the Buddhists satisfy themselves by assigning him to hell (K. P. Jayaswal, *Imperial History of India with Extracts from the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*)

### V-(b-4).

#### The Jain Versions.

##### (i)

Hariṣeṇa (C. A. D. 931-2) gives the following story of Cāṇakya in Chapter 143 of his *Bṛhat-kathākośa* <sup>23</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Edn. Dr. A. N. Upadhye, Bharaliya Vidyā Bhavan, Bombay.



There ruled in Pāṭahputra the king named Nanda, his queen was Suvratā. He had three famous ministers, Kavi, Subandhu and Sakata. In the same city lived a Brahman named Kapila who had a wife named Devilā and a son named Cānakya. Cānakya was a great scholar in all the branches of learning and his wife was known as Yaśmatī. Kapila had a sister named Bandhumatī whom Kapila gave as wife to Nanda's minister Kavi.

Once the frontier kings rose against Nanda, and Kavi, who came to know of this, duly informed King Nanda of it. The king ordered Kavi to open the coffers of the State and purchase the frontier kings. Though he himself had ordered Kavi to do this, Nanda was enraged when he learnt that thanks to this policy of Kavi, his treasury had been completely depleted, consequently he ordered Kavi and his family to be thrown into an empty well. Everyday a vessel containing food was let down into the well for Kavi's sake. Kavi told his family that he who could take revenge on Nanda might eat the food and live, and the family preferred the father to survive and take revenge. Kavi scouped out a cavity for himself on the side of the well and continued to live with the food supplied to him daily. While his family perished, Kavi managed to live for three years in that state. The frontier kings heard of this calamity to Kavi and began besieging Nanda's kingdom, immediately Nanda apologised to Kavi and lifted him out of the well. As a recompense, the king gave Kavi a

boon according to which the king accepted in the midst of all that in future Kavi alone should handle or give money to the King.

Once Kavi met Cāṇakya digging up some grass and asked him why he was doing so; Cāṇakya explained that the blade of the grass had hurt his foot and that he was therefore eradicating it completely; Kavi thought that Cāṇakya had dug out enough of it but Cāṇakya told him that if one wanted to be rid of a thing, one must pluck out the very roots of it, even as one desiring to destroy a king must behead him. On hearing this, Kavi decided that here was a man who could uproot the family of King Nanda. Kavi wrote a verse that one man, if he was endowed with knowledge of polity and resolute endeavour, could conquer the world; Cāṇakya who saw this verse endorsed the observation of Kavi. Cāṇakya once went with his wife to Kavi's place for dinner; Kavi wanted to test Cāṇakya and scattered some gold pieces in Cāṇakya's courtyard; Yaśomati, Cāṇakya's wife, gathered the pieces. She further told Cāṇakya "It seems Nanda is giving away cows to Brahmans; you go and bring a cow." At Kavi's suggestion, Nanda began giving cows to Brahmans; Kavi sent word to Cāṇakya and asked him to sit on the first seat. Cāṇakya did so but was removed from one seat to another till he had no seat, and when he complained to the man there, he (Cāṇakya) was necked out of the hall. Cāṇakya became furious and swore that he would uproot the Nanda family and proclaimed "Who ever wants the Nanda

kingdom may come to me And a man came and stood by his side Cānakya and that man retired to a safe place in the midst of the waters of the sea from there Cānakya made alliance with the kings of the frontier mountains and with their aid destroyed Nanda and established his man at Pataliputra

After a long time Cānakya became detached and took to the life of a Jain monk with five hundred pupils he turned southwards and stayed at a place west of Mahākraunca-pura Subandhu the minister of Nanda the king who had been killed by Cānakya nursed his anger against Cānakya and wanted to harm him consequently he went to hell Even now it is said the shrine of Cānakya is to be seen to the west of Krauñca-pura worshipped by the Sadhus

( 11 )

In the same book of Harṣena the last story, 15 th deals with Sakatālamuni Sakatāla was mentioned as one of the three ministers of Nanda in story No 143 narrated above Here a story of Sakatāla becoming a Jain monk is given Nanda's queen is mentioned as Sunandī The story brings together in the manner of the version in the Katha aritsūgara Nanda Vararuci Indra-datta etc Sakatāla is referred to here as having a hundred sons and the motif of being thrown into a chamber and supplied one vessel of food every day is applied here to Sakatāla and his hundred sons who consequently develop enmity towards Nanda

(iii)

In ch 8 of his *Pratistaparvan*<sup>24</sup>, Hemacandra gives his account of the Jain version of the stories of the Nandas Candragupta and Cānakya. After dealing with the story of Śakātāla Yoga Nanda and Vararuci, (cf *Brhatkathā*. kośa, story 157 mentioned above), Hemacandra comes to the story of Cānakya and Candragupta.

In the village of Canaka in the Golla country, there was a Brahman called Cani, his wife was Caneśvari, they had a son named Cānakya who had signs on his teeth showing his future fortune as a king or one equal to a king, on the suggestion of some wise men, these teeth of Cānakya were sawed. Cānakya's wife was desirous of wealth and Cānakya resolved to go to Pāṭaliputra to accept present from king Nanda. There in the palace, Cānakya sat on the very first seat which was king Nanda's own seat. Cānakya was consequently made to vacate the seat and insulted. Swearing that he would uproot Nanda, Cānakya went out in anger and searched for a man fit to become a king. There was a village called Mayūrapoṣaka where peacocks for the royal house of Nanda were being reared<sup>25</sup>. There the daughter of the chief was pregnant and Cānakya took a promise that her child would be handed over to

24 *Sthaviravalīkarita* or *Pratistaparvan* an Appendix to the *Triṣaṣṭīśālakapuruṣacarita* of Hemacandra. Ed. by H. Jacobi. Asiatic Society Bengal. Pp 212-225.

25 The peacock was evidently a delicacy of the kitchen of those days. Asoka's edicts mention peacocks as a favourite item of the royal menu.

him. A story is here told how thanks to Cāṇakya's ingenious device, the pregnant woman 'drank the moon', a story which explains the name of the son, Candragupta. Cāṇakya meantime roamed in search of alchemists with whose help he could make gold. As a boy, Candragupta played games imitative of royal acts. Cāṇakya on his return found his choice shaping alright and already fond of playing the king. The two together started on their campaign against Nānda; with money procured through alchemy, the two collected an army and attacked Nānda's capital but failed to succeed. They had two precarious escapes from the royal cavalry who pursued them.

In the course of their flight, Cāṇakya overheard an old lady finding fault with her children as being foolish like Cāṇakya; the children had been served with hot food and instead of eating it from the edges, they plunged their palms in the very centre of the food and got hurt by the food. The old lady pointed out that this was as foolish as Cāṇakya attacking Nānda's Capital without winning over the frontier and surrounding regions.<sup>26</sup> Taking wisdom from the old woman's precious observation, Cāṇakya repaired to a kingdom on the Himalayan slopes and secured the alliance of the king named Puvataka after promising him half the kingdom. They then attacked Nānda's capital; Nānda was defeated

---

<sup>26</sup> This, and the indication of royal status on the teeth of young Cāṇakya, are found also in the Buddhist accounts in the *Mahāvastu* (Ikk).

and allowed to go away singly on a chariot with his family; Nanda's daughter however fell in love with Candragupta and the two married.

On entering Nanda's palace, they found there a poison-fed damsel; Parvataka was attracted by her beauty and was allowed to have her; on her contact, Parvataka got poisoned and was allowed to perish by Cāṇakya who wanted to be rid of one to whom they were bound to give half the kingdom. Candragupta thus became the sole monarch. This happened 155 years after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvira (B. C. 313).

In the Bindusāra story which follows, Hemacandra records his version of the enmity between Cāṇakya and Subandhu found in story 143 of the *Bṛhatkathākośa* of Harīṣeṇa. According to this story again, Cāṇakya continued to be a minister in Bindusāra's time too.

In ch. 6, Hemacandra narrates the story of how Udāyin, son of Kūnika, founded the city of Pāṭaliputra, of how Udāyin was murdered by the son of a king whom Udāyin had defeated and how a certain Nanda, born of a courtesan and a barber, living in Pāṭaliputra was made king of Pāṭaliputra 60 years after the Nirvāṇa (B. C. 408). In ch 7. Hemacandra narrates the story of a Brahman named Kalpaka, son of Kapila who was very wise and whom king Nanda contrived to take as his minister. But an earlier minister of Nanda, who became jealous of Kalpaka, carried the tale to Nanda that Kalpaka was secretly planning to

make himself the king. Misled by this Nanda threw Kalpaka and his family into a deep empty well, a small quantity of food was let down the well everyday and the sons preferred to die and let their father live and avenge the wrong done to them by the king. Nanda's vassals came to know of the absence of the able minister Kalpaka and attacked Nanda, Nanda then sought Kalpaka and restored him to his position. Ch. 8 tells us that Nanda was succeeded by seven descendants. Kalpaka's sons were ministers to all these kings. The ninth Nanda's minister was Śakatāla also a descendent of Kalpaka. The story of his two sons Sthulabhadra and Śrīyaka and that of Vararuci are then narrated.

### V-(b 5)

#### The Greek Versions

Curtius says that when Alexander, after defeating Porus in the battle of Hydaspes (Jhelam) in 326 B.C. was planning to march further east into the interior of the country, he was informed that on the banks of the Ganges the largest river in all India there were two peoples the Gangaridae and the Prasii (those of the Gangarīṣṭra and the Pracyas) whose king Agrammes kept in the field 20,000 cavalry, 200,000 infantry, 2000 four-horsed chariots, and what was most formidable of all, a troop of 3000 elephants. Considering the report incredible, Alexander turned to Porus who was nearby for confirmation. Porus confirmed the account of the forces but added that the present king in the east was one of mean origin the son of a barber who having been a person of not

uncomely appearance, gained the queen's affections, and the king's confidence, and subsequently murdered the king treacherously; that the barber then pretended to act as a guardian to the young princes, put them all to death and usurped the throne; and that to him was born the present king who was equally detestable, having taken after his barber father, and was held cheap by his subjects.

Diodoros gives the same information, but mentions the elephants' number as 4000, and spells the name of the eastern king as Xandrames.

According to Plutarch, before the fight between Alexander and Porus, there were some Indian princes who had joined Alexander, and Brahmans of the Punjab reviled these princes and set up the free states to revolt, and for this, Alexander hanged many of these Brahmans. Regarding the strength of the eastern kingdom, Plutarch repeats the same information but his numbers are greatly in excess of those given above. Plutarch however adds in support of his figures the remark that these numbers are not exaggerated, for not long afterwards Androkottos (Candragupta), who had by that time mounted the throne, presented Seleukos with 500 elephants, and overran and subdued the whole of India with an army of 600,000 men. Plutarch records also the important information that Androkottos himself, who was then but a youth, saw Alexander, and afterwards used to declare that Alexander could have easily taken possession of the whole country, since the king was hated and despised by his subjects for the



wickedness of his disposition and the meanness of his origin

According to Justin, soon after Alexander's death, India had put his prefects to death, as if to shake off its neck the yoke of bondage. Sandrocottus was the leader who achieved this freedom, he was born in humble life but was prompted to aspire for royalty by some significant omens. By his insolent behaviour he offended Alexandrus (Alexander or Nandras (Nanda) and when he was ordered to be killed he fled. As he was lying asleep in fatigue a lion licked off his sweat and quietly went away. Emboldened by this good augury, he collected an army of robbers<sup>27</sup> or more probably hired soldiers, and attacked Alexander's prefects, in this fight a wild elephant voluntarily approached him and took him on its back. When, after the partition of Alexander's empire among his generals Seleucus Nicator waged wars and entered India Sandrocottus had won the throne and was reigning over India. Seleucus made a treaty with Sandrocottus and returned.

Arrian says that Seleucus warred with Androkottos, the king of the Indians who lived about that river (the Indus) until he entered into an alliance and marriage affinity with him". (C 305 B C)

[See *Ancient India Its Invasion by Alexander the Great* by J W M Crindle]

---

<sup>27</sup> This refers to the Arattas or Arattins (Arđatras) the the republications of the N W

॥ श्रीः ॥

श्रीमहादेवकृपा

## मुद्राराक्षसनाटककथा ॥

—◇◇◇—

पाटलीपुटं नाम काचन राजधानी वर्तते । तस्मिन्नगरे सर्वेऽपि  
गृहा रजमयास्तन्ति । प्रासादास्तद्व्यन्तगुप्तताः मेघमण्डलं  
स्पृशन्ति । तस्मिन्पुरे कश्चिदपि पुरुषः अकिञ्चनो नास्ति । सर्वेऽपि  
श्रीमन्तः । रूपेण तु मग्धमन्दशः, चतुर्भ्यःपि शालेषु निपुणाः ।  
सर्वेऽपि रीसकाः । मानकेषु प्राप्तेषु धनानि तृणानीय वितरन्ति ।  
स्त्रियोऽप्यन्तरस इव मुन्दर्यः । तत्र काचिदपि परपुरुषाणां  
मुखान्यपि कदापि न जानाति । तस्यां नगर्यास्तुल्या नगरी  
त्रिषु लोकेष्वपि न दृश्या । तस्यां नगर्यां पट्टपुत्रपि जनाः सुखे-  
नैव वसन्ति । तस्मिन् पट्टणे सर्वार्थनिष्ठिनाम्ना कश्चिन्महाराजः  
उपित्वा चतुस्तमुद्रपर्यन्तां पृथिवीमपालयत् ।

तस्य राज्ञः द्वे भार्ये । तयोर्मध्ये उद्वेष्टा नाम्ना सुनन्दा  
शत्रियवंशजा । द्वितीया तु सुराख्या सूतपुत्री । त्वाभ्यां भार्या-  
भ्यां सह विद्वरमाणस्य सर्वार्थसिद्धेः भूयान् कालः अत्यवर्तत ।  
तावत्पि काले तस्य पुत्रसम्पत्तिर्नाभवत् । स च पुत्रार्थं बहूनि  
तपोसि बहूनि दानानि बहूनि नतानि च चकार । एतस्मिन्न-

धसरे कश्चित्पत्नी समागतः । स राजा तस्मिन् 'अयं तदाप्रतापः ,  
अस्यानुमदेण पुत्रलाभो भविष्यति' इति निश्चित्य पत्नीभ्या सह त  
पूजयामास । तस्य पादोदकं स्वशिरसि स्वपत्नयोश्च शिरसि  
प्रीक्षयामास । तदा सुतन्दायाश्शिरसि नव जलचिन्दवः पतिताः ।  
शूद्रायाश्शिरसि एक एव जर्गविन्दुरपतत् । सा च मुरा तं जल-  
चिन्दुं भक्तिनम्रेण शिरसा सादरं प्रतिजमाह ।

स मुनीश्वरस्तस्या विनयातिशयं दृष्ट्वा मुरायां विशिष्य  
प्रसादमकरोत् । अनन्तरं स तापसः राजानं वीक्ष्य 'भपतः ज्येष्ठ-  
भार्या नव पुत्रान् प्रसोष्यते, मुराया एकः पुत्रो भविष्यति' इत्यनु-  
शृण्व यथागतं गतः ।

ततः स्वल्पे काल एव उभे अपि भार्ये गर्भिण्या जाते ।  
तत्र ज्येष्ठायाः एकः भलावूकलवःमासकोशः, अजायत । त  
दृष्ट्वा सर्वेऽपि भृशं धिक्पणाः । तदा तस्य मन्त्री राक्षसो  
नाम पर्वालोक्यत् । किमेति चेत्— पूर्वं ऋषीश्वरेण सुतन्दायाः  
नव पुत्रा भविष्यन्तीति वरो दत्तः । एवं स्थिते सुतन्दायाः मास-  
पिण्डा जातः । महर्षेर्वाक्यं कदाऽपि मिथ्या न भविष्यति । अतः  
एतन्मासखण्डं नवखण्डान् कृत्वा घृतद्रोणीषु निक्षिप्य पश्यामः ।  
उपोषणादयोऽप्येवमेव जाता इतीति दासरा. कथयन्ति । परमा-  
लाच्य तथैव चकार ।

ततः कतिपयेषु दिवसेषु समकालं तथापि पुत्रा मजायन्तः ।  
उदानीं स राजा राक्षसस्य बुद्धिकौशलमालोक्य सुतरा तुतोष ।

सर्वेऽपि जनाः तत्कर्म दृष्ट्वा भृशं विचिताः । मुरायास्तदानी-  
मेवैकः पुत्रो जातः । स च शूद्रापुत्रीऽपि अत्यन्तं प्रतिभान्वितः  
महत्सु विनीतः नीतिषु निपुणश्चाभवत् ।

क्रमेण तेषां दशानामपि पुत्राणां विवाहादींश्चकार । अन-  
न्तरं मुरापुत्रस्य शत पुत्राः पितृनुल्पाः भजायन्त । तेषु शत-  
तमश्चन्द्रगुप्तो नाम जलोच बुद्धिमान् दण्डनीतौ परिनिष्ठितः ।  
तैः पुत्रैः पिता मौर्येण च गुणउत्तया सर्वेऽपि जनः वशीकृतः ।

नवनन्दास्तु तदसहमानाः तेषु मत्सरमवदन् । कदा-  
चित् स्वार्थसिद्धिः स्वस्य कञ्चित्पुत्रं राज्येऽभिषेक्तुं मन्त्रिभिः  
सहालोचयामास । तदा स मौर्यः शूद्रापुत्रस्य मम राज्यं पिता न  
दास्यतीति मत्सरेण तावदनन्दान् प्रत्येकं भेदयामास । तद्वचनेन  
भेदिताः सर्वेऽपि 'ममैव राज्यं ममैव राज्यम्' इति कलहं चक्रुः ।  
ततो राक्षसः प्राह-राज्यं नयथा विभज्य नवानामपि दातव्यमिति ।  
ततो मौर्यस्तान् रद्दासि पृथक्पृथग्भेदयामास । ततस्त्वैऽपि 'ममैव  
पुष्पपुरं देयम्, ममैव देयम्' इति विवादमकुर्यन् । राक्षसः पुनरपि  
तानाह-एकैकः एकैकं वर्षं नगरं राज्यं च परिपालयत्विति । पुनरपि  
मौर्यभेदेन 'प्रथमवर्षे अहं राज्यं करोमि, अहमेव करोमि' इति तेषां  
विवादाऽभवत् । ततः पुनरपि राक्षसः एतत्सर्वं मौर्यकृतमिति  
मनसि निश्चित्य तान् सर्वानपि सान्त्वयित्वावाच- एवं भवत्सु  
कलहायमानेषु राज्यच्छिद्रं भवेत् । अतः शुष्माभिः कलहो  
न कर्तव्यः । गुटिकापाते यस्य प्रथमसंघर्षरा लभ्यते, स प्रथमवर्षं

राजास्त्रिवर्णि सम्मन्त्र्य तथैवाकरोत् । एव मानानायकं तद्राज्यं  
 राक्षस-स्वशुद्धिययेन स्याच्चिदपालयत् । मौर्वीय सेनापतिर्दशै ।  
 एवं स्थितेऽपि शतपुत्रेण तेन मर्मज्ञेन शस्त्रमेव तेषां गूढमक्षिपत् ।

धैर्यमस्ति स एतज्जाजनस्थानि अघ्रा-येकीकृत्य शतदीपस्थानि  
तैलान्यप्येकीकृत्य भुञ्जानः वसतु । दैवगत्या वह्निर्निर्गमा भवि-  
ष्यति चेत्, स एवास्मच्छत्रणा प्रतीकारं करोतु । इतरे वयं पुन  
अद्यैव मरिष्यामः । इतरथाप्यस्माकं श्वः मरणं सिद्धमेव ।  
तदद्यैव भवतु, तन्न को लाभः' इति । पितुर्वचनं श्रुत्वा चन्द्रगुप्त  
एक एव 'दैवं परं यद्यनुकूलं स्यात्, अहं च यदि वह्निर्निर्गमिष्यामि,  
तदा तेषां शत्रूणां विनाशं कुर्याम्' इत्यबोचत् । अनन्तरं मौर्योऽ  
पि नवनगतिपुत्रैस्सह चन्द्रगुप्तमनुगृह्य कतिपयेरेव दिनैर्गतः ।  
चन्द्रगुप्तोऽपि तमन्नराशिं भुज्या महिर्निर्गमनकालं चिन्तयन्  
तत्रैवावसत् ।

एतस्मिन्नेव काले देशान्तरात् कदाचिद्राक्षः सकाशात्  
कश्चित्पुरुषः सिद्धगर्भं पञ्जरमादाय नन्दानां समीपमागत्य  
'अस्मिन् राष्ट्रे यः कश्चिद् बुद्धिमान् अस्ति चेत्, इदं पञ्जरम-  
भित्त्वा अन्तः स्थितं सिद्धं वह्निर्विद्रावयतु' इत्याह । तद्वचनं  
श्रुत्वा राक्षसादयस्सर्वेऽपि सिद्धं तथा विद्रावयितुं उपायमा-  
विदन् । तदा मौर्याभिमानो कश्चित् बुद्धामात्य इदमाह—'मौर्य-  
पुत्रेषु चरमः चन्द्रगुप्तः ईदृशकर्मस्वतीव पटुः । इदानीं तथा  
(गतचिन्तया)\* किं कृतव्यम्' इति ।

तद्वचनं नन्दा राक्षसश्च श्रुत्वा कदाचिच्चन्द्रगुप्तो जीवेदिति

\* Not found in the Ms. but restored on the basis of  
Ravinartaka's version.

प्रत्याशया तेषां सर्वेषां वृत्तान्तजिज्ञासया चन्द्रगुप्तस्यादृष्टवशेन  
 च आलोचनशालाद्वारमुद्घाटयामासुः । ततश्च मन्त्रिणश्चन्द्र-  
 गुप्तं जीवन्तमालोक्य सन्तोषेणोपसृत्य राजानस्त्वामाह्वयन्ति,  
 आगच्छेत्यवोचन् । चन्द्रगुप्तः निर्गन्तुमिच्छत्यपि तानवोचद्-  
 'पिता भ्रातरः सर्वेऽपि गताः, अहं गन्दर्गायः जीवामि,  
 प्राणा अपि न गच्छन्ति, मम तेषां राज्ञां समीपे किं कर्तव्य-  
 मस्ति, अहमपि कतिपयैर्दिनैर्मरिष्यामि' इति । अनन्तरं राजानः  
 स्वयमागत्य 'वत्स चन्द्रगुप्त ! मा भैषीः, वहिरागच्छ, भव-  
 त्पितुरधिकारं तत्रैव दास्यामि' इति वदुः । सान्त्वयामासुः ।  
 चन्द्रगुप्तोऽपि निर्वन्धादिव यदिर्निर्जंगाम । तस्य पञ्जरस्थं सिंहं  
 प्रदर्श्य तद्वृत्तान्तमाहुः । सोऽपि सम्यगालोक्य 'जतुमघोऽयं  
 सिंहः, पन्तव्यं चलनम्, रोमाणि कृत्निमाणि' इति निश्चित्य अग्निं  
 तस्माभिर्यदशलाकाभिः सिंहमद्राजयत् । ततो राजानः सन्तुष्टाः,  
 तस्य सेनाधिपस्य दत्तं चेत्सेना क्रमशो विनाशवेदित्वा लोक्य  
 भोजनशालाधिकारं तस्मै दत्तवन्तः । चन्द्रगुप्तोऽपि तत्कार्यं  
 मपश्यत् ।

किमर्थं दर्भं चूर्णीकृत्य पिबामि ?' इत्यपृच्छत् । तदा स ब्राह्मणः  
 प्रत्युवाच—'अरं वक्ष्यामि, शृणु । अहं चाणक्यो नाम दक्षिण-  
 देश्यः । मम चरणे अयं दर्भः क्षतमकरोत् । एनं चूर्णीकृत्य  
 न पास्यामि चेत् मम कोधो न शाम्येत्' इति । ततश्चन्द्रगुप्तः  
 प्राह—'भगवन् यदि बलवान् राजा तथापरिष्यति, तदा त्वं किं  
 करिष्यसि' इति । ततश्चाणक्य आह—'मद्बुद्धिवत् त्वं  
 न जानासि । राज्ञां सहस्रमपि अयुनमपि वा बुद्धिमात्रेण  
 जतुं शक्नोऽहम् । तदास्ताम् । मन्दानां भोजनशालाधिकारी  
 चन्द्रगुप्तो नाम वृषलः आस्त इति श्रूयते । स कुत्रेदानीं  
 स्यात् ? ममातीय शुभुश्रा चर्तते । नक्षत्रमपि गन्तव्यम्' इति ।  
 चन्द्रगुप्तः प्राह—'सामिन् ! अहमेव चन्द्रगुप्तः । तदागत्य  
 सुखं भोजितुं शक्यम्' इति । अनन्तरं चाणक्यस्तं प्रत्याह—  
 'भो राजपुत्र ! ब्राह्मणस्वभावाद्राजपुत्राऽपि भवान्वृषल इत्युक्तः ।  
 सोऽयं ममापराधः क्षन्तव्यः' इति । चन्द्रगुप्त आह—'भगवन् !  
 वृषल इति त्वया यदुक्तम्, एतदेव ममानुग्रहः । अहं च तव  
 चरणयोर्गोचरत्वं किङ्करोऽस्मि । एवमेव सर्वदा व्यवहृतव्यम्'  
 इत्यभिधाय स्वसिन्ध्राणक्यस्य यथा करुणा स्यात्तथा आदिन  
 आरभ्य स्वस्य शत्रुभिः कृतमुपद्रवं पलकानुपलक्या कथयि-  
 त्वा, भोजनशालामार्गं च प्रदर्श्य 'भगवन् ! मयास्मिन् भोजनानन्तरं  
 प्रस्थानसमये मद्गृहमपि पवित्रीकरणीयम्' इति प्रार्थयित्वा  
 गृहं गतः ।



चाणक्याऽपि भोजनशाला प्रविवेश । तत्र भोजनार्थं दत्ता  
 सौवर्णभाजनानि गन्तानि शत पात्राणि चासन् । तानि दृष्ट्वा  
 चाणक्यस्तत्रत्यान् पप्रच्छ 'केषामेतानि पात्राणि' इति । सुवर्ण  
 पात्रेषु नव पात्राणि राज्ञाम् एकैकं सर्वव्याविदं ब्रह्मणस्य  
 इतराणि राजतानि पात्राणि अथवा ब्राह्मणानाम्' इति प्राहुः ।  
 चाणक्यस्तस्मिन्निष्ठदासने निपसाद । एव स्थिते राजमस्सर्वे  
 भोजनमागता चाणक्यं दृष्ट्वा कोऽयं बालः अजातशत्रु-  
 महाविदुषः योग्यः अग्रासने निषण्ण इति पप्रच्छुः । चाणक्यः  
 'अजातशत्रुर्वा भवामि न वा, विद्याया यदि मम समं कश्चि-  
 दस्ति तर्ह्यगच्छतु' इत्यवदत् । अथ न दा 'अहङ्गतं अयं बहु-  
 निरस्तताम्' इति स्वपुरुषं आसनादाकपयामासुः । तदा जन-  
 सरुद्धाकृष्यमाणं चाणक्यं शिखा विमुच्य कोपनं न दान् समूल-  
 ह वा शिखा निवधामाति प्रत्यजानात् । नन्दास्तु श्रुधार्ता  
 ब्राह्मणं यत्किञ्चित्प्रलयतीति जहसुः । चाणक्यं बहिः निष्क्रम्य  
 चन्द्रगुप्तस्य गृहं गत्वा न दानिदृत्य तत्र राज्यं दास्यामीति प्रति-  
 ज्ञाय, वक्तव्यं सर्वमुक्त्वा, इन्दुशर्माणं नाम स्वस्य सतीर्थ्यं ब्राह्मण-  
 मब्रूय, तस्य वक्तव्यमभिधाय, पर्वतकेश्वरं नाम म्लेच्छराज-  
 सुपगम्य, स्वयोग्यतां प्रकटीकृत्य नन्दै कृतं स्वायमानं स्वस्य  
 प्रतिज्ञां च कथयि वा 'मम सहायेन त्वं सैन्यं सहागत्य यदि  
 नन्दां निहनिष्यसि तर्हि तव राज्यार्थं दास्यामि' इत्यवदत् ।  
 पर्वतकेश्वरोऽप्यालोचयामास- अयं तव ब्राह्मणं बुद्धिमानिव

लक्ष्यत । नन्दराज्यमर्मज्ञश्च । एतत्साहाय्यकं लब्धं चेन्मम  
नन्दराज्यं सर्वं प्रदीतुं शक्यम्' इति निश्चित्य, तं सन्तुष्ट्य नन्दैः  
सह योजुं सेतासन्नाहमकरोत् ।

एवं स्थिते चाणक्यस्य राज्ञा इन्दुशर्मा नाम ब्राह्मणोऽपि  
क्षपणकूपेधारी जीवसिद्धिरिति स्वनाम प्रकाश्य, राक्षससमीपं  
गत्वा, स्वस्य नीतिशास्त्रे ज्योतिःशास्त्रे मन्त्रशास्त्रे च नैपुण्यं  
प्रकटोक्त्य, तत्समीपे बाधितत्वेनावसत् । राक्षसोऽप्यालोच-  
यामास—'चाणक्या नाम ब्राह्मणः यद्वैरो निर्गतः । स च  
कदाचिद् अस्मास्वभित्तिरादिकं करिष्यति । अयं च क्षपणको  
जावसिद्धिः अस्माकं सखा वर्तते । ब्राह्मणानां क्षपणकानां च  
समागसिद्धौ विराधः । तस्माच्च णक्येन क्रियमाणम् अभि-  
चारादिकम् अयं प्रतिकरिष्यति' इति तस्मिन्प्रतीव मैत्रीमकार्षीत् ।  
एवं प्रधानभूतराक्षसघ्नेन तत्रत्याः सर्वेऽपि सेनापतयः तस्य  
क्षपणकस्य स्वाधीना जाताः । स च कदाचिद् 'भविष्यति  
अस्मिन्मालेऽस्मिन्दिने युष्माकं षोडश भविष्यति' इति राक्ष-  
सादान् रक्षसुर्जया, तस्मिन्त्रय दिने काचित्कृत्यामुत्पाद्य  
तेषां भीतिमुत्पाद्य, 'केनचिद्ब्राह्मणेन युष्माकमुपरि कृत्या प्रयो-  
जिता, अहं तां शमयिष्यामि । मम पुरतः ब्राह्मणानां योग्यता  
कादशी' इत्यभियाय, इक्ष्मिन्मयूरपिण्डकाभ्रमणमात्रेण तां  
कृत्या शमयामास । एवमादिभिः प्रत्यक्षसिद्धैः तदीयसामर्थ्यं  
विशेषं राक्षसादीनां तस्मिन्प्रतीव विश्वासोऽभवत् । तदुक्तं

सर्वेऽपि नान्यथा कुर्वन्ति ।

एवं स्थिते 'अस्मिन् दिते पर्वतकेभ्यः तन्दैः सह योद्धुमाग-  
मिष्यति' इति गूढवारसुजेन विदित्वा क्षपणकः तन्दसेनापतीनां  
गृहं गत्वा प्रत्येकं रहस्यमवदत् — 'भाविन्यां वैशाखपूर्णिमास्यां  
तव ग्रहगतिर्विपरीता वर्तते । तस्यां तिथौ राशो महद्युद्धमाग-  
मिष्यति । तदा भवता युद्धार्थं गतं चेत् त्वं मरिष्यसि । अत-  
स्त्वया न गन्तव्यम् । इदं रहस्यमेव वर्तताम् । कस्यापि  
निकटे न कथनीयम्' इति । एवं सर्वानपि मन्त्रिणो भट्टाश्च  
प्रत्येकं रहसि शोधयामास । ते सर्वेऽपि तद्वाक्यं तथ्यमिति  
गृहीतवन्तः । एवं सति वैशाखपूर्णिमास्यां महान्निर्भेल्लघ्नै-  
रसह पर्वतकेभ्यश्चाणक्यौ पुष्पपुरमुगच्छन्तौ । राक्षसोऽपि  
सर्धान् सेनापतीन् युद्धार्थं नियोजयामास । ते सर्वेऽपि क्षपणक-  
वाक्ये दिव्यास्तात् 'अस्मिन्दिनेऽहं योद्धुं गच्छामि चेत् मरिष्यामि'  
इति प्रत्येकं निश्चित्य युद्धाय न गतवन्तः । नवनन्दा राक्षसश्च  
कतिपयैर्भटैः सह नगराभिरगत् भेल्लैश्चैस्मह युयुधिरे । ततश्च  
परिमितपरिवारतया चाणक्यमतिबलपरिगृहीतैर्वहुभिः पर्वत-  
केभ्यरयलैः नव नन्दा व्यापादिताः । राक्षसस्तु पराक्रमावि-  
शयेन चाणक्योपेक्षया च स्वयमक्षत एवास्त ।

मपि भर्तृननुयामि चेद्रिपुषु जीवत्सु तेषु प्रतीकारमकृत्वा स्त्री-  
यन्निव्रजमानो जगतामुपहान्यो भवेयम् । एकेन मया बहवः  
प्रतिभटाः चतुर्योषायेन जेतुं न शक्यन्ते । अतो बुद्धिवलेन  
क्रमेण जेयाः । ताश्च जित्वा मम्रास्वामिकुलकूटस्थं वृद्धं सर्वार्थ-  
सिद्धिमेव राजानं राज्ये स्वापयित्वा चिरभुक्तमर्हपिण्डानुष्यं  
मया सम्पादनीयम्' इति निश्चित्य अन्तर्गृहमासर एव चन्द्र-  
गुप्तचाणक्यपर्वतकेश्वरैस्तन्निमग्नजत् । चन्द्रगुप्तं च गत्वा  
प्रणम्याबोधत्—'दिष्टयाऽस्य राज्यस्य भवान् राजा जातः ।  
अस्माकं भवानपि स्वामिपुत्रः । नन्दा अपि स्वामिपुत्राः । एता-  
वन्तं कालं नन्दानामिरेत-परं ममोऽपि वयं पोषणीयाः' इत्य-  
भिधाप्य चन्द्रगुप्तेनानुमोदितः कदाचिद्रहसि पर्वतकेश्वरमुपेत्य  
तं भेदयामास—'चन्द्रगुप्तोऽयं शूद्रापुत्रः राज्यमिदं नाहंति ।  
अतस्तं छद्मना घातयित्वा सर्वमपि राज्यं तवैव दापयिष्यामि ।  
चाणक्योऽपि ब्राह्मण-त्वया निराकृतः कापि पलायिष्यते' इति ।  
पर्वतकेश्वरोऽपि सर्वं तथेत्यर्होचकार । पर्वतकेश्वरराक्षसयोश्च  
विशिष्य मैत्री/सञ्जाता ।

चाणक्योऽपि राक्षसस्थादायं बुध्या निश्चित्य, जये लब्धेऽ-  
पि पुष्पपुरं शीघ्रमिदानीमस्त्वामि- प्रवेष्टुं न शक्यम्, छद्मनाऽस्मान्  
हन्तुं राक्षस- कमन्युपायं कल्पितवान् स्यान्, अतस्तत्सर्वं  
शोधयित्वा नगरं प्रवेष्टव्यम्, पर्वतकेश्वराद्यापि शुद्धसाहाय्यार्थं  
राज्यार्थं ददामीति मया प्रायुक्तम्, स च छद्मना घातयितव्या,

इतरथा चन्द्रगुप्तस्य सकलराज्यप्रदानमस्माभिः प्रतिज्ञातं न कृतं स्यात्', इत्यालोच्य चन्द्रगुप्तपर्वतकेश्वराभ्यां सह नगराद्वहिरप्ये स्थित्वा, राक्षसवृत्तान्तं चारमुद्येन शोधयन् कतिविदिनानि स्थितः ।

एवं स्थिते चन्द्रगुप्तं रक्षसि घातयितुं राक्षसः क्षपणकमुपायमप्राक्षीत् । क्षपणकोऽपि राक्षसमाचक्षे- 'मया तावदत्यन्त-सुन्दरी तरुणरूपा काचन कृत्या सृज्यते । तां च सकृद् य-काञ्चित्पुरुष उपभुङ्के चेत्, तदानीमेव सा कृत्या तं घातयिष्यामि स्वयमपि तिरोभवति' इत्युक्त्वा विषकन्यकां सृष्ट्वा राक्षसाप-ददौ । राक्षसोऽप्यनया कन्यया चन्द्रगुप्तं घातयितुं शक्नोमिति निश्चित्य पूर्णमनोरथः सन् राक्षी पर्वतकेश्वरचाणक्यचन्द्रगुप्तेषु सभायामासीनेषु तथा कन्यया सह चन्द्रगुप्तमुपगम्यावोचत्- 'देव ! अत्यन्तरमणीयरूपं किमपि तरुणीरक्षं मद्वशे पतंते, तद्य-देवस्य योग्यमिति मया देवसमीपमानीतम्' इति तां कन्या-दर्शयामास । तां च दृष्ट्वा चन्द्रगुप्तपर्वतकेश्वरौ स्मरपरवशा-यभूताम् । चाणक्यस्तु क्षपणकमुद्येन पूर्वमेव विषकन्या-वृत्तान्तं विदितवान् । अस्माकमर्धराज्यहरस्य पर्वतकेश्वरस्य मारणं कारणीयमिति निश्चित्य तदानीं चन्द्रगुप्तमवोचत्- 'वृषल अत्यन्तोपकारिणे पर्वतकेश्वराय प्रथममागतमिदं कन्या-रत्नमनुग्रह्य न त्वया भोक्तुं युक्तम्' इति । चन्द्रगुप्तोऽपि चाणक्यवाक्येन तथेत्यङ्गीचकार ।

पर्वतकेश्वरोऽपि तां कन्यामादाय परमानन्दमन्थरः शय्या-  
मन्दिरं प्रविश्य तथा सह विहर्तुमुद्युक्तो मारितश्च । राक्षसोऽपि  
“विनायकं प्रकुर्वाणो रचयामास चानरम्” इति न्यायेन मयाऽ-  
न्यदुपक्रान्तमन्यदेव फलितम्, चन्द्रगुप्तं निहन्तुमुद्युक्तेन मया  
चन्द्रगुप्तस्य राज्यार्धहरत्वेन शत्रुरस्त्रनिहतं पर्वतकेश्वर एव  
घातितः, अत्रानात् त्वरावशाच्चेमं वृत्तान्तं पर्वतकेश्वरे नोक्त-  
वानस्मि पूर्वमेव, इतः परं प्रातःकाले पर्वतकेश्वरं मृतं विपकन्यां  
च तिरोहितां दृष्ट्वा चन्द्रगुप्तदूतकः मामुग्रदण्डेन घातयिष्यति,  
अतो राक्षावेव मयाऽस्मादेशात् पलायितव्यम्, पलायितेन च येन  
केनचिदुपायेन चन्द्रगुप्तमुच्छेत्तुं उद्योगः कर्तव्यः” इति निश्चित्य,  
नगरं प्रविश्य, सर्वार्थसिद्धिं तापसपेयेण तपोपमं प्राप्य, दाह-  
वर्मप्रभृतीनाम्पुरुषान् चन्द्रगुप्तं उद्यता घातयितुं नियुज्य, तेषां च  
प्रवर्तनार्थं स्वस्याततमं शकटदास नामं कायस्थं महता धन-  
निक्षेपेन सह स्थापयित्वा, स्वस्यात्यन्तसुदृढो मणिकारथेष्टिन-  
श्चन्दनदासस्य गृहे स्वगृहजनं कलत्रपुत्रादिकं निक्षिप्य पलायं  
चकार ।

परेद्युः प्रभातकाले शपनगृहादिनिष्क्रान्तं पर्वतकेश्वरमा-  
लोक्य कषाटमुद्धाट्य शय्यायां प्रसीतं पर्वतकेश्वरमपश्यन्, कन्यां  
च नापश्यन् । ततश्चास्माकप्रत्यन्तमुपकारी मित्रं पर्वतकेश्वरः  
राक्षसेन मन्सरेण घातित इति विपण्ण इव कासौ दुरात्मा राक्षसः,  
गृह्यतामिति चारान्ग्रापयामास । चाराश्च राक्षसं विचित्र्य,

रात्रायेव कापि पलायितो न दृश्यते इति चाणक्याय निवेद-  
यामासुः । चाणक्योऽपि पर्यालोचयामास— 'अस्माकमर्थ-  
राज्यहरः पर्यंतकेश्वरदुल्लेन घातितः, 'भक्षितेऽपि लशुने न  
शान्तो व्याधि.' इति न्यायन तत्पुत्रो मलयकेतुः भ्राता वैरोधक-  
श्च वर्तते, पूर्वप्रतिश्रुतमर्थराज्यं ताभ्यां देयमायतति, एवं च  
सति पर्यंतकेश्वरवधः अस्माकं विश्वासघातमात्रे दोषे पर्यवस्यति,  
अतस्तावपि कथञ्चिद्वातयितव्याविति चेच्चाणक्य एव राज्य-  
लोभेनात्यन्तसुदृढोऽपि घातितगानिति महापकीर्तिः प्रतिष्ठा-  
पिता भवेत्, अतः पूर्वमेव मलयकेतुना सह कण्टमैत्रीं ग्राहितेन  
भागुरायणेन मलयकेतुः कथञ्चिद् बोधयित्वा स्वदेशं प्रापणोप',  
वैरोधकमत्रैव स्थापयित्वा तद्वधे पश्चादुपायं विधास्यामि'  
इति निश्चित्य मलयकेतुभेदनाय भागुरायणं योजितवान् ।

भागुरायणश्च पितृमरणशोकमन्ततं मलयकेतुं रहसि रोध-  
यामास—'कुमार ! चाणक्योऽयमत्यन्तकृतघ्नः, देवं पर्यंतकेश्वर-  
माधित्यं राज्यार्थं दास्यामीति प्रतिश्रुत्य सम्भूतनद्वन्द्वनभिसम्भेन  
देवेन समूलमुन्मूलितेषु सकलारातिषु तस्मै राज्यार्थं प्रदेशं  
स्यादिति मत्वा मित्रदोहपातकी देवं पर्यंतकेश्वरं छद्मना व्यापा-  
दितवान्, इतः परं कुमारोऽत्र क्षणमात्रं वर्तते चेत् कीदृशं वा द्राह्मं  
समीक्षेत, अतः 'जीवन्मद्राणि पश्यति' इति न्यायेन स्वराष्ट्रं प्राप्य,  
चाणक्यपुत्रोः वैरनिर्यातनोपायः पर्यालोच्यताम्' इति । तच्छ्रुत्वा  
मलयकेतुरपि तत्क्षणमेव सैन्यैः सह देशमयासीत् । वैरोधकस्तु

चाणक्येनाश्वत्थितः राजपार्थिव्यामलंभेन तत्रैवावात्सीत् ।

एवं स्थिते पूर्वमपक्रान्तो राक्षसः पलायितं मलयकेतुं निशम्य नमात्रित्य प्रत्यथोपीत्—‘दुरात्मना चाणक्यदूतकेनास्माकं स्वामि-कुलम् अकस्मादेव नाशितम्, तदप्यास्ताम्, अस्माकमत्यन्त-मितं देवः परितकेश्वरः छद्मना व्यापादितः, सचाणक्यं चन्द्र-गुप्तमुन्मूल्य भवन्तमेवाभिपेक्षयामि’ इति । मलयकेतुरपि राक्षस-महिमाभिज्ञः तथेति स्वीकृत्य राक्षसं प्रधानसचिवपदे स्थापयामास । तत्र च मलयकेतोः स्वाधीनाः पञ्च राजानः कौलूताधिपश्चित्रार्मा, मलयाधिपः निडनादः, कादम्बोराधिपतिः पुष्कराक्षः, सिन्धुदेशाधिपः सिन्धुसेनः, पारसीकाधिराजो मेघाह्व इति । तान् राक्षसो मलयकेतुश्चावोचताम्—‘युष्माकं साहाय्येन चन्द्रगुप्तो जितः, अनन्तरं च चन्द्रगुप्तस्य विषयदृष्ट्यादिकं युष्मभ्यं दास्यामि’ इति । तेऽपि राजानस्तथेति स्वीकृत्य तत्रैव सेनासन्नाहं कुर्वन्तेऽवसन् । ते च राक्षसस्य गुणातिशय-मालोक्ष्य तस्मिन् पिशित्यानुरक्ता बभूवुः ।

राक्षसोऽपि तैः सह तत्र वसन् चारमुखेन प्रत्यहं कुसुमपुर-वासिनां जीवतिद्धिप्रभृतीनां स्वमुहदां चाणक्यचन्द्रगुप्तद्रोहार्थं प्रोत्साहनं कुर्वन्नास्त । एवं स्थिते चाणक्यः कुसुमपुरवासिनः सर्वान् शिल्पिनः सूत्रधारान् च समाहूय आदिदेश—‘अस्यां रात्रौ चन्द्रगुप्तस्य राजप्रथमप्रवेशाय दैवदुर्मुहूर्तो निरूपितः, अतो नगरद्वारस्य दृष्टित्येव मार्गो युष्माभिः परिष्कर्तव्यः’ इति । तत-



स्तेऽवदन्—‘आर्य ! प्रथममेव देवस्य चन्द्रगुप्तस्य नन्दभवनप्रवेशो भविष्यतीति सूत्रधारेण दाक्षवर्मणा कनकतोरणन्यासादिभिः संस्कृतं राजभवनद्वारम्, अस्माभिरिदानीम् अभ्यन्तरे संस्कार आधेयः’ इति । तच्छ्रुत्वा दाक्षवर्मणा बुद्धिमोहाद्रागप्रकर्षाद्वा नियोगकालमप्रतीक्षमाणेन संस्कृतं राजभवनद्वारमिति चाणक्यस्य चेतसि यत्नवान् वितर्कौ जातः । प्रकाशं च तान् समुष्ट इवाचष्ट—‘दाक्षवर्मन् ! अचिरादस्य दाक्ष्यस्यानुरूप फलमधिगमिष्यसि’ इति । ततश्चानुकूललक्षणवशादर्घरात्रे चन्द्रगुप्तस्य नन्दभवनप्रवेशो भविष्यतीति शिष्यिनः पौराण्य भावितार्थान् कृत्वा तस्मिन्नेव क्षणे पर्वतकेभ्यश्चातरं वैरोधकं चन्द्रगुप्तेन सदैकाक्षेण निवेद्य कृतः पृथ्वीविभागः । ततश्च प्रथममेव प्रकाशिते चन्द्रगुप्तस्य नन्दभवनप्रवेशे कृताभिपेक्षे किल विमलमुक्तागुणपरिक्षेपविरचितचित्रपटमणिमयापवारणप्रच्छादितशरीरे मणिमकुटनियमितवचिरतरमौलौ सुरभिकुसुमवैकल्यावभासितविपुलवक्षस्स्थले परिचिततमैरपि अपरिज्ञायमानाकृतौ चाणक्यस्यानुग्रया चन्द्रगुप्तोपवादिनी चन्द्रलेखां नाम वशामारुह्य चन्द्रगुप्तानुयायिना राजलोकेनानुगम्यमाने नन्दस्य भवनं प्रविशति वैरोधके राक्षसप्रयुक्तेन सूत्रधारेण दाक्षवर्मणा चन्द्रगुप्तोऽवमिति मन्वमानेन वैरोधकस्योपरि निपातनाय सज्जीकृतं यत्नतोरणम् । अत्रान्तरे यदिर्निगृहीतयादेपु स्थितेषु चन्द्रगुप्तानुयायिषु, राक्षसप्रयुक्तेन चन्द्रगुप्तनिपादिना चन्द्रगुप्तोऽवमिति वैरोधकं दत्तुं

कामेन यर्ररेकेण कनकदण्डिकान्तर्हिताम् असिपुत्रिकामाक्रष्टु-  
कामेन अवलम्बिता करेण कनकट्टङ्गलमिखलावलाम्बिनी कनक-  
दण्डिका । ततः जघनाभिघातमुन्मेषमाणा गजवधूः अति-  
जगत्या गतिभेदमासादितवती । प्रथमगतानुरोधप्रत्याकलि-  
तमुक्तेन प्रभ्रष्टलक्ष्यं पतता यन्त्रतोरणेन चन्द्रगुप्तबुद्ध्या वैरो-  
धकं हन्तुं समुत्कृष्टकृपाणपाणिः अनासादयन्नेव च तं हतो  
यर्ररुः । ततो दारुवर्मणा यन्त्रतोरणनिपात आत्मविनाश-  
मात्रफलम् अवधार्य सत्वरमेव उत्तुङ्गतोरणमारुह्य यन्त्रवट्ट-  
नट्टोदकीलमादाय यन्त्रतोरण निपात्य हस्तिनीगत एव हत-  
स्तपस्वी वैरोधकः । ततो दारुवर्मापि वैरोधकपुरस्सरेण पदाति-  
लोकेन नैकलोष्ट्यातेन पशुमारं मारितः । एवम् मर्घराज्य-  
हरं वैरोधकं, चन्द्रगुप्तं हन्तुकामं दारुवर्माणं घातयित्वा, अक्षतेन  
चन्द्रगुप्तेन स चाणक्यो नन्दमयनं प्रविवेश ।

तदनन्तरं राक्षसप्रणयिना अभयदत्तनाम्ना राजवैद्येन चन्द्र-  
गुप्ताय औषधमुपहतम् । तच्च स्वयं प्रत्यक्षीकुर्वता चाणक्येन  
कनकभाजने वर्णान्तरमुपलभ्य अभिहितश्चन्द्रगुप्तः — 'वृषल !  
सविषमौषधं न पातव्यम्' इति । ततश्च स एव वैद्यस्तदौषधं  
पायितश्च उपगतश्च । तदानीं चन्द्रगुप्तस्य शयने अधिकृतः  
चन्द्रगुप्तं गूढ निद्वन्तुं राक्षसप्रेरितः प्रमोदको नाम राक्षसेन पूर्व-  
मेवातिरुष्ट महान्तमर्थराशिमाप्य महता व्ययेनोपभोक्तुमा-  
रब्धः । स च चाणक्येनाहूय कुतस्तवायं भूयान् धनागम इति

पृच्छामानो वाक्यभेदान् बहून्वादीत् । तदा चाणक्यदेशा-  
द्विचित्रवधेन व्यापादितः प्रमोदकः । शयितस्य चन्द्रगुप्तस्य  
शरीरं प्रतिहन्तुं राक्षसेन प्रयुक्ता बीभत्सकादयः नरपतिशयन-  
गृहाभ्यन्तरे अन्तस्तुरङ्गामुपेत्य प्रथममेवावसन् । एवंस्थिते  
चन्द्रगुप्तप्रवेशात् प्राक् शयनगृहे प्रविष्टेन चाणक्येनावलोकितं  
तद् गृहम् । ततः कस्माच्चिद् भित्तिच्छिन्नाद् गृहीतभक्ष्यावयवानां  
पिपीलिकातां पङ्क्तिं निष्क्रामन्तीमवलोक्य पुद्गलममेतद् गृह-  
मिति गृहीतायं चाणक्यस्तदेव शयनगृहमवाहयत् । तस्मिन्  
दह्यमाने धूमावच्छददृष्टयः प्रथमविहितं मार्गमनधिगम्य बीभत्स-  
कादयः तत्रैव ज्वलनमुपगताः ।

ततः प्रभृति सहस्रगुणमप्रमत्तञ्चाणक्य आसीत् । एभ्यः  
ईदृशं भविष्यतीति कुसुमपुरवासिनः राक्षसस्यासत्पुरुषान्विष्णुं  
नानाविधान् प्रणिधीन् प्रेययामास । तदानीं चाणक्यः राक्षसस्य  
पराक्रमातिशयं नीतिशास्त्रे पारीणतां स्वामिमकिदार्यं च  
पयोलोच्य 'राक्षसमेव चन्द्रगुप्तस्यामात्यपदे स्थापयितुं यतो  
विधेयः', इतरथा चन्द्रगुप्तस्य ज्वलद्गम्याः सूर्ये न सम्प्रगतिः,  
तं च स्थापयित्वा तीर्णप्रनिर्धारणेन मया तपस्तप्तुं पूर्ववदाधर्मो  
गन्तव्यः ; राक्षसश्च स्वामिमपत्यतिशयेन त कदाचिदप्यस्वामि-  
सन्धास्यति . तस्माद्वनगज इव उपायैरेव ग्रहीतव्यः , प्रथमं  
च कस्मिंश्चिदपि जीवति नन्दाग्रयागावयवे वृषलस्य साचिभ्यं  
प्रादयितुं न शक्यते , तदभिषेगं प्रति तु निरुद्योगः शक्योऽ

वस्थापयितुम्' इति पर्यालोच्य तपोवनगते तपास्त्रिने नन्दवंशीयं  
सर्वार्थसिद्धिं वाञ्छितवान् । पुनरपि राक्षसप्रद्वेषे उपायमन्वि-  
ष्यन् अवतिष्ठ । तदानीं चन्द्रगुर्ताऽपि चाणक्यानुज्ञया पर्व-  
तकेश्वरस्य पारलौकिकं निर्वर्तयन् पर्वतकेश्वरेण धारितपूर्वाणि  
महाघाण्याभरणानि चाणक्यप्रेषितेभ्यः विश्वाद्यसुप्रभृतिभ्यः  
त्रिभ्यो धातृभ्यो दानं ददौ । तांश्च गृहीताभरणान् चाणक्यो  
रहस्याद्वय 'इमान्याभरणानि मलयकेतुकटके राक्षसनिकटे  
विक्रीयागच्छत' इति प्रेषयामास । ते च तथेति गत्वा तान्या-  
भरणानि राक्षसाय दर्शयामासुः । राक्षसोऽपि पर्वतकेश्वरस्या-  
भरणातीत्यजानन् महाघाण्याभरणातीनि पश्यन् क्रियाणीति  
यदुत्तरेण मूढेन तान् सन्तोष्य तान्याभरणानि स्वकोशगृहे  
स्थापयामास ।

एवं स्थिते चाणक्यप्रेषितेषु चारेषु निपुणको नाम कश्चित्  
परगृहप्रवेशे अशङ्कनीयं यमपटमादाय प्रतिगृहं धर्ममुपदिशन्  
भिक्षमाणः कदाचित् पुष्पपुरवासिनः मणिकारथेष्ठिनश्चन्दन-  
दासस्य गृहं प्रविष्टवान् । तत्र च प्रविश्य यमपटं मत्तार्य धर्म-  
गीतानि गायन्नास्त । तस्मिंश्च गायति तच्छ्रुत्वा कौतूहलो-  
त्कूलनयन-अत्यन्तसुकुमाराकृतिः पञ्चवर्षदेव्यः कश्चन कुमारः  
कस्माच्चिदपर्वरकात् निर्जगाम । ततश्च 'हा निर्गतो ह्य निर्गतः'  
इति तस्यापर्वरकस्य मध्ये महानचलाजनस्य कोलाहलः समुल-  
लास । तत्र काचिदत्यन्तसुन्दरी ईषद्द्वारदेशदर्शितमुखी बहिः

प्रसारितेन पाणिना झटित्येव तं बालकमादायान्तर्गतवती ।  
 तस्याश्च कुमारसंरोधचलिताङ्गुलिपल्लवात्करकमलाद् गलिता  
 पुरुषाङ्गुलिप्रमाणघटिता मुद्रिका भूमौ निपत्य चक्रभ्रमेण भ्रमन्ती  
 निपुणकपादमूलं गता । सा च स्त्री तन्मुद्रापतनं न ज्ञातवती ।  
 निपुणकोऽपि तन्मुद्रामादाय तस्यां लिखितानि राक्षसस्य नामा-  
 क्षराणि वाचयित्वा, 'राक्षसस्येय मुद्रिका, सा च राक्षसगृहिणी  
 यस्याः करादियं निपतिता, स च कुमारो राक्षसस्यैव, नूनं  
 सुहृत्तमस्य चन्दनदासस्य गृहे कलत्रपुत्रादिकं न्यासीकृत्य  
 राक्षसो निर्गतः' इति निश्चित्य तां मुद्रिकामादाय चाणक्यस-  
 मीपं गत्वा तां मुद्रिकां दत्त्वा वृत्तान्तं च सर्वं निवेदितवान् ।

चाणक्योऽपि तन्मुद्रालाभेन नितान्तमानन्दितः अतयैव  
 मुद्रया राक्षसो ग्रहीतव्य इति निश्चित्य किञ्चिन्पत्र लिखित-  
 वान् । ततश्च राक्षसस्य प्रियवपस्येन शकटदासेन पूर्वमेव  
 कपटसण्डं प्रादितं सिद्धार्थकमाहूय तच्च पत्रं दत्त्वा 'एभिरक्षरैः  
 केनापि किमपि कस्यापि स्वयं वाच्यम्' इति भदत्तवाह्यनामानं  
 लेखं शकटदासेन लेखयित्वा मामुपतिष्ठस्व, न चाख्येयमस्मै  
 चाणक्यो लेखयति' इत्येवमादिष्टवान् । सिद्धार्थकोऽपि तथा  
 शकटदासेन लेखयित्वा तं लेखं चाणक्याय दर्शयामास ।  
 चाणक्योऽपि तयैव मुद्रया तं लेखं मुद्रयित्वा, लेखे मुद्रा च  
 सिद्धार्थकदस्तेऽप्ययित्वा, तमाह- 'कस्मिन्चिदासजनानुष्ठेये कर्मणि  
 त्वां व्यापारयितुमिच्छामि ; तस्मिन् विषये त्वया सिद्धार्थक

इति नाम यथार्थं कर्तव्यम्' ; तत् किमिति चेत् 'शकटदासस्ता-  
वद्राजाज्ञया शूलमारोपयितुं नेयते , प्रथममेव त्वया वध्यस्थानं  
गत्वा घातकास्सरोपं दक्षिणाक्षिसङ्कोचसंज्ञा प्राद्वयितव्या , तत-  
स्तेषु गृहीतसङ्केतेषु भयापदेशादितस्ततः प्रवृत्तेषु शकटदासो  
वध्यस्थानादपनीय राक्षसं प्रापयितव्यः ; तस्माच्च सुहृत्प्राण-  
परिरक्षणपरितुष्टात् पारितोषिकं ग्राह्यम् ; राक्षस एव कञ्चि-  
त्कालं सेवितव्यः , ततः प्रत्यासन्नेषु वलेषु प्रयोजनमिदमनुष्ठेयम्'  
इति कर्णे कमप्यर्थं कथयामास । अयमर्थः पूर्वोक्तलेख्यार्थश्च  
पश्चात् स्फुटीभविव्यति ।

सिद्धार्थकोऽपि तथेति चाणक्यं प्रणम्य निर्गतः । चाणक्योऽ-  
पि 'जीवसिद्धिर्नाम क्षपणकः राक्षसप्रयुक्तः विषकन्दया पर्वत-  
केश्वरं घातितवान् , स एतमेव दोषं प्रख्याप्य सनिकारनगरा-  
न्निर्वासयताम् ; यथायमपरः कायस्थः शकटदासो नाम राक्षस-  
प्रयुक्तो नित्यमरुच्छरीरमभिद्रोग्धुं यतते , स चाप्येनं दोषं  
प्रख्याप्य शूलमारोप्यताम् , गृहजनश्चास्य वन्धनागारं प्रवेश्य-  
ताम्' इत्याद्याप्य सनिकारग्रेष्ठिनचन्दनदासमानयामास । चाण-  
क्येनाहुतमात्रः स्वगृहस्थितैः घनसेनप्रमुखैः राक्षसकुटुम्ब रङ्ग-  
स्यन्यत्र नीत्वा चाणक्यमागतवान् । चाणक्येन च 'राक्षसेन  
भवद्गृहे निहित कुटुम्बं समर्पय' इति प्रार्थितोऽपि अपलापमेव  
कृतवान् । ततश्चात्यन्तकुपितश्चाणक्यः दुर्नृपात्मदिदेश- 'अयं  
राक्षसस्य कलत्रं स्वगृहमानीय याच्यमानोऽपि न प्रयच्छति,

तस्माद् गृहीतगृहसारमेनं सपुत्रकलत्रं सयम्य रक्ष यावन्मया  
 वृषलाय कथ्यते ; वृषल एवास्य प्राणहरं दण्डमाह्वययिष्यति'  
 इति । तच्छ्रुत्वा दुर्गपालः तथेति चन्दनदासेन सह निर्गतः ।  
 चन्दनदासोऽपि सुदृढकार्यपरतया प्राणपरित्यागेऽपि निर्भय  
 एवासीत् । चाणक्योऽप्यालोचयामास—

“त्यजत्यग्निष्वन्प्राणान्यथा यस्यायमापदि ।

तथैवास्यापदि प्राणाः नूनं तस्यापि न प्रिया ॥”

तस्मादिदानीं लब्धो राक्षस” इति ।

ततश्च सनिकारं नगराद्विर्वासितः क्षणकः राक्षससमीप  
 गत्वा पूर्ववदास्त । शकटदासमपि पूर्वोक्तप्रकारेण बध्यभूमे-  
 रादापापकान्तः सिद्धार्यकः । तच्च ध्रुत्वा सन्तुष्टेन यदि परि-  
 कुपितेनेह चाणक्येन शकटदासप्रदणार्थं प्रेषिता इव पूर्वमेव  
 रहसि चाणक्येनाज्ञताः भागुरायणमद्रभटपुरुषदत्तद्विह्वरातबल-  
 गुप्तराजसेनरोहिताक्षविजयवर्माणोऽपि मलयकेतुकटकं प्रति  
 पलाययामूवु । चाणक्योऽपि तच्छ्रुत्वा बहुकोपमभिनयन् सर्वा-  
 नप्याहरानीति व्याहरन् इदानीं राक्षसो गृहीत इति निश्चिन्वन्  
 आस्त ।

एवं स्थिते राक्षसप्रणिधिः आहितुषिडकवेपो विराघगुप्तो  
 नाम राक्षसनिर्गमात्प्रभृति शकटदासस्य शूलारोयणाय नयन-  
 पर्पन्तं सर्वं कुसुमपुरवृत्तान्तं विचार्य मलयकेतुकटकं गत्वा राक्ष-  
 साय न्यरेदयत् । राक्षसोऽपि दासवर्मप्रभृतीनां यथं ध्रुत्वा

विषण्णोऽभवत् । प्रियसुहृदः शकटदासस्य शूलारोपणं निशम्य  
 शोकसागरमग्नः भृशमभूणि मुञ्चन् स्थितवान् । तदानीमेव  
 शकटदासः सिद्धार्थकेन सह राक्षससमीपं गत्वा प्रणतवान् ।  
 राक्षसोऽपि मृत्युमुखात्प्रमुकमिव पुनर्जातमिव शकटदासं दृष्ट्वा  
 सरमसमुत्थाय आलिङ्ग्य केन भवान् शूलारोपणाद्रक्षित इति  
 पृष्टवान् । शकटदासोऽपि 'अनेन प्रियसुहृदा सिद्धार्थकेन चा-  
 णक्यमृत्युमुखात्परिरक्ष्य अमात्यपादमूलम् आनीतोऽस्मि' इति  
 सिद्धार्थकं दर्शितवान् । राक्षसोऽपि कतिपयदिनेभ्यः पूर्वं मलय-  
 केतुना प्रेम्णा स्वगात्राद्वतार्यं प्रेषितानि तदानीं स्वयं घृता-  
 न्याभरणानि सिद्धार्थकाय पारितोषिकं दत्तवान् । सिद्धार्थ-  
 कोऽपि सङ्घर्षं गृहीत्या पादयोर्निपत्य राक्षसे विज्ञापितवान्-  
 'चाणक्यद्वतकस्य विप्रियं कृत्वा पुनरपि पाटलीपुरे प्रवेष्टुं न  
 शक्यमिति अमात्यपादा जानन्त्येव, तस्मादमात्यपादे एव  
 शुश्रूषमाणः अत्रैव धस्तुमिच्छामि ; तथा मे प्रसादः कर्तव्यः ;  
 इदं च पारितोषिकम् अनया मुद्रया मुद्रितम् अमात्यस्यैव भाण्डा-  
 गारे तिष्ठतु ; यदा मे प्रयोजनं तदा ग्रहीष्यामि' इत्युक्त्या, 'भद्र  
 एवं क्रियताम्, अस्माकमत्यन्तं प्रियम्' इति राक्षसेनोक्ते, तथैव  
 मुद्रया पारितोषिकं मुद्रयित्वा राक्षसस्य भाण्डागारे स्थापया-  
 मास । तदानीं राक्षसः तां मुद्रां स्वनामाङ्कितमालोक्य, 'उत्क-  
 ण्ठाविनोदनार्थं नगराभिष्क्रामतो मम हस्ताद् गृहिण्या गृहीता  
 मुद्रा, कथमन्यद्वस्तमागता' इत्यालोचयन् यमञ्ठ - 'भद्र सिद्धा-



र्थक ! कुतस्त्वयेयं मुद्रा अधिगता' इति । सिद्धार्थकोऽपि प्रत्यवा-  
दीत्—'अस्ति कुसुमपुरे मणिकारधेष्टी चन्दनदासो नाम , तस्य  
गृहद्वारे पतिता इय मुद्रिका समासादिता' इति । राक्षसोऽपि  
तच्छ्रुत्वा युक्तमिति मन्यमानः यद्वृत्तरेण मूढ्येन सिद्धार्थक  
सन्तोष्य ता मुद्रां गृहीत्वा 'इतः परमनयैव मुद्रया स्वाधिकारे  
व्यवहर्तव्यम्' इति शकटदासद्वस्ते दत्तवान् । सोऽपि तथाऽ-  
स्थिति गृहीत्वा पूर्वपरस्वाधिकारं पालयन्नास्ति ।

भागुरायणोऽपि रक्षसि चाणक्यानुमत्या पुष्पपुराधिगत्  
मलयकेतुसमीपं गतः । मलयकेतुनाऽपि चाणक्यादनेन मम  
प्राणाः परिरक्षिता इति कृतश्रुतया सौहृदेन च स्वस्थान-तरा-  
धिकारे स्थापितो भागुरायणः राक्षसमलयकेतुभेदनाय समर्थ  
प्रतीक्षमाणोऽवर्तत । भद्रभटमभृतयोऽपि पुष्पपुरात्पलायिता  
सन्तः मलयकेतुसेनापतिं शिखरकं द्वारीकृत्य मलयकेतुं दृष्टवन्तः ।  
सोऽप्येते चाणक्यापरागेण समागता इति सेनाधिपत्यगजा-  
भ्याधिपत्यादितत्तदुचिताधिकारेषु तान् स्थापितवान् । राक्षसोऽ-  
पि चाणक्यचन्द्रगुप्तभेदनाय प्रयतमानः तदर्थं चारान् पुष्पपुरं  
प्रति मेपयन्नास्ति ।

एवं स्थिते चाणक्यश्चन्द्रगुप्तं रेडस्ययादीत्— 'मामन्तरेण  
त्वया किञ्चित्कालं व्यवहर्तव्यम् ; मदाद्योल्लङ्घनादिकमपित्वयाऽ-  
ग्निनेतव्यं , तेन चास्माकं किञ्चित्कार्यं साधनीयमस्ति' इति ।  
चन्द्रगुप्तोऽपि कथञ्चित्तथेत्यङ्गीचकार । ततः कदाचिच्छर-

पारम्भे तगरे कौमुदीमहोत्सवः कर्तव्य इति चन्द्रगुप्तः पौरा-  
नाज्ञापयामास । पौराश्चातीव सन्तोषमभजन् । चाणक्यस्तु  
तच्छ्रुत्वा कौमुदीमहोत्सवो न कर्तव्य इति पौराधिपिद्वान् । ततश्च  
अप्रवृत्तकौमुदीमहोत्सवकुसुमपुरमण्डलोक्य रुष्टश्चन्द्रगुप्तः, चाण-  
क्येन प्रतिपिद्धः कौमुदीमहोत्सव इति श्रुत्वा चाणक्यमाहूय  
पप्रच्छ 'किमर्थमार्येण कौमुदीमहोत्सवः प्रतिपिद्धः ? न कदा-  
चिदार्यस्य निःप्रयोजना यवृत्तिः' इति । चाणक्यः प्रत्युवाच—  
'राजन् ! धूनाम्, इह खड्ग्यशस्त्रकारास्त्रविधा तिलिमुप-  
वर्णयाम्, तद्यथा—राज यत्ताम्, मन्त्रिवायत्ताम्, उभयायत्ता  
चेति, तन्मन्त्रिवायत्तन्निन्देभवेत् किं प्रयोजनान्वेषणम् ?'  
तच्छ्रुत्वा चन्द्रगुप्तः सरोप इव मुखं परावर्तयामास । एतस्मि-  
न्प्रकारे राक्षसप्रयुक्तो वैतालिकश्चन्द्रगुप्तमुपश्लोक्तवान्—

'भूषणानुपमोनेन यभुर्भगति न प्रभु ।

परैरनभिभूताशस्त्रमय प्रभुरुच्यते ॥'

आश्चर्यं चाणक्यो राक्षसस्याय प्रयोग इति ज्ञातवान् । चन्द्र-  
गुप्तस्तु तस्मै वैतालिकाय स्वर्णानां दशमहस्र दयमित्याज्ञापया-  
मास । चाणक्यस्तु 'न देयम् किमयमस्थाने महानर्थोत्सर्गः क्रि-  
यते' इत्याह । चन्द्रगुप्तोऽपि 'मार्येणैव सर्वत्र निरुद्धचेष्टाप्रसरस्य  
पन्थनमिध राज्यं न स्वदत्ते' (इत्याह) । चाणक्य आह—'स्वयमन-  
भियुक्तानां राजामेते दोषा भवन्ति, तद्यदि न सहसे ततः स्वयं

मेवाभियुद्धव' । चन्द्रगुप्त आह— 'एते वयमेव स्वकर्मण्यभियु-  
ज्यामहे' । चाणक्य आह— 'कल्याण न. , वयमपि स्वकर्मण्यभि-  
युज्यामहे' । चन्द्रगुप्त आह— 'यद्येव तर्हि कौमुदीमहोत्सवप्रति-  
पेघस्यैव प्रयोजनं थोतुमिच्छामि । चाणक्य आह— 'कौमुदीमहो-  
त्सवानुष्ठानस्य किं फलमिति वयमपि थोतुमिच्छाम' । चन्द्र-  
गुप्त आह— 'प्रथमं ताव-ममाज्ञाव्याघात' । चाणक्य आह—  
'ममापि त्वदाज्ञाव्याघात एव प्रतिपेघस्य प्रथमं प्रयोजनम् , अथ  
द्वितीयं प्रयोजनमपि थोतुमिच्छामि, तर्हि कथयामि , इत अप-  
क्रम्य मलयकेतु समाश्रितैः मद्रभटप्रभृतिभि विज्ञातममां राक्ष  
सापदेशप्रण' महीयसा म्लेच्छराजवलेन परिधृत पितृवधा  
मर्षितः मलयकेतुरस्नानभियोन्मुचत. , सोऽयं व्यायामकाल  
नोत्सयकाल इति , अत दुर्गसस्कारे प्रारब्धे किं कौमुदी  
महोत्सवेन' इति प्रतिपिद्धम् ।

चन्द्रगुप्त आह— 'आर्यं 'यद्दु प्रष्टव्यमन्नास्ति' । चाणक्य  
आह— 'विस्त्रब्धं पृच्छ, मया वद्दाख्येयमत्र' । चन्द्रगुप्त आह— 'एष  
पृच्छामि' । चाणक्य आह— 'एष कथयामि' । चन्द्रगुप्त आह—  
'योऽस्माकमस्य नर्यस्यानर्थस्य हेतुः स मलयकेतुरयकामन् कस्मा-  
दुपेक्षित ?' चाणक्य आह— 'मलयकेतोरपक्रमणेऽनुपेक्षिते द्वे गती  
स्याताम् , तस्य निग्रहो या पूर्वाप्रतिश्रुतराज्यार्घदान वा ; निग्रहे  
तावदस्य अस्माभिः पर्यंतको दत्त इति हनप्रताया. स्वयं दत्तो  
दत्त स्यात् । प्रतिश्रुतराज्य(र्घ)दाने तु पर्यंतकथिताः केवल-

मेव कृतघ्नतामात्रफलः स्यादिति मलयकेतुरपकामन्नुपेक्षितः ।  
 चन्द्रगुप्त आह—‘अस्तु तावदेवम् ; राक्षसस्तु पुनरिद्वैवान्तर्नगरे  
 वर्तमानः आर्येणोपेक्षित इत्यत्र किमुत्तरम् ? ’ चाणक्य आह—  
 ‘राक्षसोऽपि यल्लु स्वामिनि स्थिरानुरागत्वात्सुचिरमेकत्र वासाच्च  
 नन्दानुरक्तानां प्रकृतीनामत्यन्तविश्राम्याः प्रजापुरुषकाराभ्या-  
 मुपेतः सहायसम्पदा युक्तः क्रोधावातन्तर्नगरे वर्तमानः महा-  
 न्तमुत्पादयेदन्तःक्षोभम् ; दूरीकृतस्तु बाह्यक्षोभमुत्पादयन्नपि  
 न दुःसाध्यो भविष्यति, इत्यपकामन्नुपेक्षितः ; विक्रम्य गृह्यमाण-  
 स्तु अस्मद्वलानि नाशयेत्, स्वयं वा नश्येत् ; एवं च मति  
 तद्ग्रहणे एनावानसाकं महो व्यथः स्यात्’ इति । चन्द्रगुप्त  
 आह—‘न शक्नुमो वयमार्यस्य वाचं वाचाऽतिशयितुम् ; सर्वथा  
 समात्यराक्षस एव प्रशस्यतरः’ । चाणक्य आह—‘न भवानिति  
 वाक्यशेषः ; ‘किं तेन राक्षसेन कृतम् ?’  
 चन्द्रगुप्तः—‘किमार्येण कृतम् ?’  
 चाणक्यः—‘साम्बन्धं नन्दम् उद्धृत्य भवान् राज्ये प्रतिष्ठापितः’  
 चन्द्रगुप्तः—‘नन्दकुलद्विपिणा दैवेनेदमनुष्ठितम् ।’  
 चाणक्यः—‘दैवमविद्वांसः प्रमाणयन्ति ।’  
 चन्द्रगुप्तः—‘विद्वांसोऽप्यविकन्यना भवन्ति ।’

तच्छ्रुत्वा चाणक्यः महान्तं कोपमाभिनीय, पुनः कोपं मंहृत्य,  
 ‘वृषल ! अल्लुत्तरोत्तरेण ; ययस्सच्चो राक्षसः प्रशस्यो भवति, नहि  
 गृह्यतामिदं शस्त्रम्’ इति शस्त्रमुत्सृज्य स्वगृहमयात्रीत् । चन्द्र-

गुप्तोऽप्यनादृत्य चाणक्यं राजकार्याणि करिष्यतीति नगरे  
प्रख्यापनमाज्ञाप्य अन्तःपुरं प्रविष्टवान् । अयं च सर्वो वृत्तान्तः  
करभकमुखेन राक्षसेन द्वातः ।

एवं स्थिते कदाचिन्मलयकेतुर्भागुरायणं प्रत्याह 'सखे भागु-  
रायण ! विशापितोऽहमागच्छाद्भिः भद्रभटप्रभृतिभिः यथा न  
वयममात्यराक्षसद्वारेण कुमारमाश्रयामहे , किन्तु कुप्रारस्य  
सेनापतिं शिखरमेन द्वारोक्त्य दुष्टामात्यपरिगृहीताच्चन्द्रगुप्ताद्  
अपरक्ताः कुमारमाश्रयामहे इति ; तदाप्रभृति पर्यालोचयन्नापि  
तेषां तात्पर्यं न जानामि ; अस्माकमत्यन्तं हिततमं प्रियतमं च  
राक्षसं परित्यज्य द्वारान्तराश्रयणे किं कारणम्' इति । ततो  
भागुरायणः प्राह—'कुमार ! एवमेतन् ; राक्षसस्य तावच्चाणक्यो-  
पर्येव द्वेषः, न चन्द्रगुप्ते ; कदाचिच्चन्द्रगुप्तः इतं चाणक्यमम-  
हमातः निराकरोति चेत्, ततो राक्षसः चन्द्रकुलीनोऽयमिति  
भयत्या संयतसुहृद्जनमोक्षापेक्षया चन्द्रगुप्तेन सह सन्दधीत ।  
एवं सत्यस्मात्त्वपि कुमारे न विश्वमेदिति भद्रभटादीनां तात्पर्यं  
स्पष्टमेव' इति । तच्छ्रुत्वा मलयकेतुः भागुरायणोक्तं श्रुत्वा मेवेति  
गृहीतवान् । ततश्च राक्षसचारैः स्तनकलशादिभिर्भेदितः चन्द्र-  
गुप्तश्चाणक्यं निराकृतवानिति वृत्तान्तश्रवणेन मलयकेतोर्मनसि  
भागुरायणोक्तमेव दृढीकृतमासीत् । तदनन्तरं राक्षसे सन्देह-  
वानपि मलयकेतुः कार्यार्थं पूर्ववदेव विश्वासयुक्त इवासीत् ।  
एवं स्थिते कुसुमपुरोपरोधाप मलयकेतुराक्षसादपः सेनाभिः

सह प्रवस्यरे । तदानीं राक्षसः चित्रवर्मप्रभृतीन् पञ्च राज्ञः  
मलयकेतुरक्षणाय मलयकेतुं परिचार्यागन्तव्यमित्याज्ञाप्य इतरा-  
नपि मागधगान्धारयवनादीन् सेनामुखादिषु स्थातुं यथायोग्य-  
माज्ञापयामास । तदा च दिने दिने कुसुमपुरे सन्निहिने सति,  
चाणक्यचाराः कपटेनागत्य अन्तर्भेदादिकं करिष्यन्तीति  
राक्षसेन काचिद् व्यवस्था 'कृता मुद्राचिद्धितैरेव पुरुषैः अस्मत्कट-  
काद्वहिर्गन्तव्यमागन्तव्यमिति च' इति । तन्मुद्रादाने च भागु-  
रायणो नियुक्तः ।

एवं स्थिते क्षणको जीवसिद्धिः राक्षसेन सह कक्षाधि-  
कारणादिरोधमभिनीय भागुरायणसमीपं गत्वा कटकाद्वहि-  
र्गमनाय मुद्रां प्रार्थयामास । भागुरायणोऽपि 'अस्मिन् काले  
अत्यन्तमित्रम् अमात्यराक्षसं विहाय तव प्रस्थाने किं कारणम्'  
इति पप्रच्छ । जीवसिद्धिरपि प्रस्थाने कारणमनुक्त्वैव 'यत्नं राक्ष-  
सस्य नामापि न श्रूयते तत्र गच्छामि' इति यदन् राक्षसे महाग्तं  
कोपमभिनयामास । ततो भागुरायणेन निर्गन्धपूर्वकं गृष्टः कथ-  
ञ्चिदिव कथयामास—'अहं तावन्मन्दमारुह्यः प्रथमं राक्षसेन सह  
मित्रत्वमुपगतः ; तदानीं राक्षसेन गूढं विषकृयामुत्पाद्य पर्यंतकं-  
ध्वरो व्यापादितः ; तच्छ्रुत्वा चाणक्येन देवाश्विर्वासितोऽस्मि ;  
इदानीमपि राक्षसेन राजकार्यकुशलेन किमपि तादृशमारुह्यते,  
तेनाहं लोकादेव निर्वासितो भविष्यामि । तेनाहं राज्ञमं विहाय  
यत्र कापि गन्तुं व्यवमिनोऽस्मि' इति । तच्छ्रुत्वा भागुरायणः

सुहृदां पूर्णप्रतिष्ठतप्रतिपादनेन सत्यं सत्यसन्धः प्रतिपाद-  
यितुमर्हति । एतेऽप्येवमनुगृहीताः सन्तः स्वाश्रयोन्मूलनेन  
मयन्तमाराधयिष्यन्ति । अविस्मृतमप्येतत्सत्यवन्तं स्मरयामि ।  
तेषां मध्ये केचिद्रेः कोशदन्तिभ्यामार्थिनः केचिद्विषयार्थिनः ।  
मलभारक्षयं च श्रीमता यत्रनुप्रेषितं तदुपगतम् । मयाऽपि  
लेखस्याशून्यार्थं किञ्चिदनुप्रेषितम् । वाचिकं च भाषितमात्रं  
सिद्धार्थकाद्येतद्व्यम्' इति । ततः सिद्धार्थकं पप्रच्छ 'सिद्धार्थक,  
कथापं लेखः ? वाचिकं तावत्स्वतः केन द्योतयम्' इति ।  
ततः किमपि न जानामीति अपलपन्तं सिद्धार्थकं पुरुषैस्ताडय-  
मास । ततस्साध्यमानस्य नस्य कक्षात् राक्षसमुद्राङ्किता अमरण-  
पेटिका निपतिता । ततः इदमेव लेखस्याशून्यार्थं भाषेभ्यतीति  
निश्चित्य तां पेटिकामुदाहृत्य मलयकेतुः स्वशरीरादवतार्य राक्ष-  
साय दत्तमाभरणमपदयत् । ततो मलयकेतुः राक्षसेन चन्द्र-  
गुमाय प्रेषितोऽप्यं लेख इति निर्दिश्य पुनरपि सिद्धार्थकं  
वाचिकं ब्रूवति ताडयामास । ततः सिद्धार्थको मलयकेतो-  
भरणपोनिपत्यामयं प्रार्थयामास । ततो मलयकेतुः 'भद्र !  
पराधीनस्य तथाभयमेव । परं तु यथावस्थितं कथय' इति मलय-  
केतुमोक्षः सिद्धार्थकः सर्वं कथयामास— "कुमार ! महं अमात्य-  
राक्षसेन इमं लेखं दत्त्वा चन्द्रगुप्तसकाशं प्रेषितोऽस्मि । वाचिकं  
तु 'मम प्रियवयस्याः चित्तवर्मोदयः पञ्च राजानः ; तेषु द्वौ  
कोऽहंस्मिभ्यामर्थिनौ, इतरे विषयामिडापिणः, तस्मात् यथा

चाणक्यं निराकृत्य मम मित्रमुत्पादितं तथैतेषामपि पूर्वप्रति-  
 ष्ठातार्यः महाराजेन सम्पादनीय' इति ।" तच्छ्रुत्वा मलयकेतुः  
 चित्रवर्मादीनां राक्षसे भक्तिं च आलोच्य चित्रवर्मादयोऽपि  
 मया द्रुह्यन्तीति निश्चित्य राक्षसमानेतुं पुरुषमाज्ञापयामास ।  
 तेनाहूतो राक्षसः पूर्व मलयकेतुमेपिनाभरणस्य व्ययीकृतत्वाद्  
 विश्वावसुप्रभृतिभ्यः क्रीतान्याभरणानि धृत्वा मलयकेतुसमीप-  
 माजगाम । आगत्य च यथापूर्वं स्वेनानुष्ठितं सेनाया राज्ञा यथा-  
 योग्यं निवेशनं कथयामास । तच्छ्रुत्वा मलयकेतु 'ये चित्रवर्मा-  
 दयः मद्दिनाशेन चन्द्रगुप्तं भाराघयितुमुत्तुका' त एव मा परि-  
 वृण्वन्ति' इति निश्चित्य राक्षसं पृष्टवान्—'आर्य इदानीं कुसुमपुर-  
 यः कश्चित् गच्छति वा आगच्छति वा' । राक्षस आह—'नास्ति  
 इदानीं गमनागमनप्रयोजनम् ; कतिपयैर्दिनैः वयमेव तत्र यास्या-  
 मः ।' मलयकेतुराह—'यद्येवम्, किमर्थमायं कुसुमपुरं प्रति  
 सिद्धार्थकहस्ते लेखं प्रेषितः' । राक्षस आह—'अये सिद्धार्थकः  
 किं तत्' ? ततः स व्याप्य सिद्धार्थकः प्राह—'ताडितेन मया कथितं  
 रहस्यम् ।' ततः कीदृशं रहस्यमिति राक्षसेन पृष्ठोऽपि तूष्णी-  
 मधोमुखस्तस्थौ । ततः स्वामिनः पुरस्ताद् भीतो लज्जितो वा  
 सिद्धार्थको न कथयिष्यतीति भागुरायणः स्वयमाह यथा 'अह-  
 ममात्रराक्षसेन लेखं दत्त्वा वाचिकं च सन्दिश्य चन्द्रगुप्तस्य  
 सकाशे प्रस्थापित इति सिद्धार्थकं कथयति' इति । तच्छ्रुत्वा  
 राक्षसः प्राह—'ताडितोऽयं मिथ्या कथयति । ताडितं किं वा



न प्रयाद्' इति । ततो मलयकेतुः प्राह--'तर्हि भागुरायण ! राक्ष-  
समुद्रालाञ्छितं लेखं राक्षसस्य दर्शय' इति । तद् दृष्ट्वा राक्षसः  
प्राह 'मुद्रा लेख्यमपि कपटनोत्पादयितुं शक्यते' इति । ततो  
मलयकेतुः प्राह--'तर्हि लेखस्य अशून्यार्थम् इदमाभरणजातम्  
आर्येणानुप्रेषितम् ; तत्कथमेतदपि कपटं स्यात् ' । राक्षसः प्राह--  
'इदमाभरणं न मया प्रेषितम्, किन्तु कस्मिंश्चित् यरितोपस्थाने  
सिद्धार्थकाय दत्तम्' । भागुरायण आह--'अमान्य ! कुमारेण  
स्वगात्रादवतार्य दत्तस्य ईदृशभूषणस्य ईदृशाय दानमिति कथं  
थक्षेयम् ? भद्रं सिद्धार्थक ! केनायं लिखितो लेखः ?' । ततो राक्ष-  
सस्य मुखमवलोक्य तूष्णीं स्थित्वा पुनश्च ताडिता 'शकटदासेन  
लिखितो लेखः' इत्याह । ततो राक्षसोऽपि 'यदि शकटदासेन  
लिखितः तर्हि मयैव लिखितः' इत्याह । ततो भागुरायणः प्राह--  
'शकटदासोऽपि राक्षसस्य पुरतः खड्गं लिखितमिति नाङ्गी-  
करिष्यति ; तस्मात् शकटदासस्य प्रतिलिखितं राक्षसमुद्रा च  
माननीयताम्' इति पुरुषमावाप्य तेन मानीने राक्षसोऽपि संवादं  
दृष्ट्वा शकटदासेनैव शत्रुपक्षपातिना कपटः प्रयोगः कृत इति  
निश्चितवान् । ततो मलयकेतुः राक्षसेन धृतं स्वपितुः अलङ्कार-  
त्वं विलोक्य एतदेव अलङ्कारत्वं लेखे लिखितं चन्द्रगुप्तेन  
राक्षसाय प्रेषितमिति निश्चित्य राक्षसं पप्रच्छ--'एतदाभरण-  
त्वं कुतः प्राप्तम्' इति । ततो राक्षसः घणिग्भिः क्रीतमित्याह ।  
ततो मलयकेतुः 'मार्य, तातेन धूनपूर्वाणां विशेषतश्चन्द्रगुप्तमुप-

गणानाम् ईदृशाभरणानां वणिग्भ्यः क्रयादधिगम इति न सम्भा-  
यितम्' इत्याह । ततो राक्षसो मनस्यचिन्तयत् 'सुखित्प्रोऽयमभूत्  
शत्रोः प्रयोगः । कुतः—

लेखोऽयं न ममेति नोत्तरमिदं मुद्रा मदीया यतः

सौहार्दं शकटेन खण्डितमिति भक्षेयमेतत्कथम् ।

मौर्ये भूयणविक्रय नरपतौ को नाम सम्भावयेत्

तस्मात् संप्रतिपत्तिरेव हि वर न प्राप्यमधोत्तरम् ॥'

इति तूष्णीं स्थित । ततो मलयकेतुः प्राह—'पूर्वमत्यन्तविस्मयं मम  
पितरः पर्वतकेश्वरः विषकम्पाप्रयोगेन मारयित्वा इदानीं मामपि  
तथा कर्तुम् उद्युक्तोऽस्मीति निश्चितमेव' इति । ततो राक्षसे  
'नाहं पर्वतकेश्वरे विषकम्पाधारोपितवान्' इति कथयति स्मति,  
जीवसिद्धिना तस्य भाषयामासु (?) । ततो राक्षसः हृदयमपि म-  
रिपुणा स्वीकृतमिति निश्चित्य विषण्णस्तस्थौ । ततो मलयकेतुः  
राक्षसमालोक्य 'नाहं भवानिव विस्मयमध्याती, तद्गच्छ सर्वा-  
त्मना, समार्घीयता चन्द्रगुप्तं, चन्द्रगुप्तं च चाणक्यं च । वा च  
चन्द्रमूलायितुं समर्थोऽहम्' इत्युक्त्वा राक्षससौहार्देन मस्माकं  
द्रोण्युकामान् चित्रवर्मादीन् घानयितुं आह्वयितवान् । ते च तथा  
यातिता । राक्षसोऽप्येकाकी बहिर्निर्गत्य आलोचयामास—

'किं गच्छामि तपोवनं न तपसा शाम्येत्सर्वैर मन

किं भर्तुं ननुयामि जीवति रिपौ स्त्रीणामिदं चेष्टितम् ।

किं वा सङ्गसखः पताभ्यरिचले नैतच्च युक्तं मधेत् ,  
चेतश्चन्दनदासमोक्षरमसं कन्यात्कृतघ्नश्च चेत् ॥

तस्मादसदर्थं प्राणानपेक्षः सुहृत्तमश्चन्दनदासः कथञ्चिन्मोच-  
यितव्य' इति गूढः सन् कुसुमपुरदाह्यजीर्णोद्यानमाजगाम ।

ततो मलयकेतोः स्वजनविनाशात् तस्य सेनायां व्याप्य  
स्थिताः भागुत्पायणभद्रभट्टप्रभृतयः मलयकेतुम् भयमेव समय  
इति संयम्य गृहीतवन्तः ।

एवं स्थिते तस्मिन् जीर्णोद्याने चाणक्यपेरितं वन्दनेन प्राण-  
त्यागोद्युक्तं कश्चित्पुरुषं दृष्ट्वा राक्षसः पृष्ठशान्—'किमर्थं प्राण-  
त्याग करोषि' इति । असौ न कथयन्नपि राक्षसनिर्वन्धेन कथ-  
ञ्चित् कथितवान्—'भस्मिन्नगरे अमात्यराक्षसस्यात्यन्तमित्रं  
चन्दनदासो नाम मणिकारश्रेष्ठी वर्तते ; तस्य सुहृद् विष्णुदास  
इति कश्चिद्विद्यते ; स च मम प्रियवयस्यः ; इदानीं तु यन्निप्रवेशं  
कर्तुं नगराभिष्क्रान्तः ; ततः सुहृद्विरुद्धमपेक्ष्य प्राणत्यागः श्रेयान्  
इति मत्स्यां मया पथमारब्धम्' इति । इत्थं च पुरुषेण विज्ञापितो  
राक्षसः पुरुषं प्रति 'त्वत्सुहृदो विष्णुदासस्य मरणोद्योगे किं  
कारणम्' इति पप्रच्छ । पुरुषोऽपि कालहरणे स्वस्यासम्मतिं  
भावयन्नित्यमुक्तवान्—'योऽयं चन्दनदासस्य सुहृद् विष्णुदासो  
नाम , स तावत् स्वसुहृदश्चन्दनदासस्य राक्षसकृते संयमनमसह-  
मानः चन्द्रगुप्तसमीपे गत्वा मर्षयिनिमयेन चन्दनदासं मोचयेति  
प्रार्थितवान् ; चन्द्रगुप्तोऽपि नास्माभिरर्थकारणात् चन्दनदासो

यद्दः, किन्तु अमात्यराक्षसगृहजनमपवार्य बहुशो याचितोऽपि न दत्तवान्, अस्मादेव कारणाद् बद्धः' इत्युक्त्वा पुरः स्थितं जनं प्रति 'यदि चन्दनदासः अमात्यराक्षसस्य गृहजन न समर्पयति तर्हि मारय' इति आदिदेश ; अनन्तरमपि चन्दनदासः सुहृद्वात्सल्येन अमात्यराक्षसगृहजनं न समर्पितवान् ; नीतिश्च बध्यस्थानम् ; ततश्च प्रियसुहृन्मरणात्पूर्वमेव मर्तव्यमिति निश्चित्य मत्प्रिय-  
 वयस्यो विष्णुदासः नगराग्निष्कान्तः' इति । इत्थं च पुरुषेण विज्ञापितो राक्षसः पुरुषं प्रति 'मास्तु ते भयम् ; विष्णु-  
 दासं अग्निप्रवेशान्नियारय ; अहमपि चन्दनदासं मृत्युमयान् मोचयामि' इति अवोचत् । पुरुषेणापि संशयेन 'के भवन्त' इति पृष्टो राक्षसः पुरुषाय स्वं नाम प्रत्यपादयत् । पुरुषश्च राक्षसं प्रति वभ्राण—'पूर्वं शकटदासो नाम कश्चित् चन्द्रगुप्तादेशाद् बध्यस्थानं नीतः, स च केनापि देशान्तरं मापितः ; ततश्च चन्द्रगुप्तेन स्वाज्ञोऽल्लघनमसहमानेन बध्यस्थानाधिकृताः सर्वेऽपि घातिताः ; ततः प्रभृति घातकजनाः सर्वेऽपि अवमत्ताः सन्तः स्वकार्यं पश्यन्ति ; तस्माच्छोभं भवद्भिर्गन्तव्यम्' इति । राक्षसोऽपि एतादृशं पुरुषवचनं निशम्य चाणक्यबुद्धिकौशल्ये विस्मयमा-  
 वहन् इत्थमचिन्तयत्—

'नार्यं निस्त्रिशकालः प्रथममिह कृते घातकानां विनाशे  
 नीतिः कालान्तरेण प्रकटयति फलं किं तथा कार्यमत्र ।  
 औदासीन्यं न युक्तं मियसुहृदि गते मत्कृतमेव घारां  
 व्यापत्तिं शतमस्मिन् स्वतनुमहमिमां निष्क्रियां कल्पयामि ॥'

तस्मादचिरेण चन्दनदाससमीपे गन्तव्यमिति निश्चित्य यत्र  
चाणक्यमेपितौ सिद्धार्थकसमृद्धार्थकौ चण्डालेषधारिणौ  
भूत्वा चन्दनदास वधार्थं नीतवन्तौ, तं देशमाजगाम । तत्र च  
बहुधा द्वाहेति रुदतः सपुत्रकलत्रादेः समाधानं कुर्वन्तं चण्डा-  
लाभ्यां च निर्भर्त्स्यमानं सुहृदर्थं तृणवाप्राणान्मोक्तुं व्यवसित-  
वन्तं समिप्यसुहृदं चन्दनदासं दृष्ट्वा राक्षसः ससम्भ्रमस्तन् घात-  
कजनान् प्रस्थाह—‘न खलु भगवन्ति चन्दनदासो व्यापादयितव्यः ।

येन स्वामिकुलं रिपोरिव कुल दष्टं चित्तद्वयपुरा  
मित्राणां व्यसने महोत्सव इव स्वस्येन येन स्थितम् ।  
आत्मा यस्य वधाय च परिभवक्षेत्रीकृतोऽपि प्रियः  
तस्येयं मम मृत्युलोकपदवी यध्यस्नगावधताम् ॥’ इति ।

तच्छ्रुत्वा चन्दनदासः सवाप्यगद्गदस्तन् राक्षसं प्रति ‘अमाल्य !  
किमेतदाचर्यते’ इत्युदत् । राक्षसः ‘त्यदीयचरितैकदेशानुवर्तनं  
खादिदम्’ इत्युक्त्वा चन्दनदासे च बहुशः समाधाय चण्डालं  
प्रति पूज्यं चाणक्याय निवेदयेति अवादीत् । तयोश्चण्डा-  
लयोः एकः सपुत्रदारेण चन्दनदासेन सह श्मशानपादपमूले उपा-  
विशत् । अपरस्तु राक्षसेन सह चाणक्यगृहं गत्वा ‘एष गृहीतो  
राक्षस’ इति दौवारिकमुखेन चाणक्यं न्यवेदयत् । तच्छ्रुत्वा  
चाणक्यः विस्मयानन्दाभ्या परमशो भूत्वा राक्षसं च अयश्यत् ।  
राक्षसोऽपि चाणक्यं दृष्ट्वा इत्यममन्यत—‘अयं दुरात्मा चाण-  
क्य, अयं महात्मा चाणक्यः ।

आकर सर्वशाखाणां रत्नानामिव सागरः ।  
गुणैर्न परितुष्यामो यस्य मत्सरिणो ययम् ॥' इति ।

चाणक्योऽपि राक्षसमालोक्ष्य सयद्गुमानं मणनाम । राक्षसश्च न  
मा चण्डालस्य शंढूपितं स्पृष्टुमर्हसीत्यबोचत् । चाणक्यस्तच्छ्रु-  
त्वा स्वकृतसंविधानं सर्वमपि राक्षसप्रत्यायनाय व्यजिह्वपत् ।  
यथा 'अमात्यराक्षस ! नेमौ चण्डालौ, किन्तु एकः सिद्धार्थको  
भवता दृष्टपूर्वं । योऽप्यन्यः सोऽपि राजलोकसेवी समृद्धार्थकः ।  
शकटदासोऽपि स्वयं किमपि न जानाति, मया तु कपटनेत्र  
लेखितः, अयं चात्र सप्रहः—

भूत्या भद्रमटादयः स च तथा लेखः समृद्धार्थक  
स्तद्यालङ्करणत्रयं च भवतो मित्रं भदन्तः किल ।  
जीर्णोद्यानगतः स ण्य पुरुषः क्लेशः स च धौष्टिनः  
सर्वं मे वृषलस्य धीरं भवता सयोगमिच्छोर्नयः ॥

तदयं वृषलस्त्वां द्रष्टुमिच्छति' इति । राक्षसश्च तदाकर्ण्य शकट-  
वासं मतिं छिन्नसंशयस्संन चन्द्रगुप्तदर्शनम् असम्मतवापि  
निर्वन्धवशादभ्युज्जगाम । ततश्च क्षातवृत्तान्तं चन्द्रगुप्तोऽपि  
तुष्टमानसः चाणक्यनीतिनैपुण्ये भृशमाश्चर्यमुद्बुधन् सपरिवार  
आगत्य चाणक्यं प्राणसीत् । ततश्चाणक्येन पैतृकोऽयम् अमात्यो  
राक्षसः, एनमभिवादयेति निवेदिनश्चन्द्रगुप्तः राक्षसं प्रणि-  
ययात् । कृताशीर्यचनश्च राक्षस इत्यमचितयत्—

‘द्रव्यं जिगीषुमाधिगम्य जडात्मनोऽपि  
नेतुर्यशस्विनि पदे नियतं प्रतिष्ठा ।  
अद्रव्यमेव भुवि शुद्धनयोऽपि मन्त्री  
जीर्णाथयः पतति तीरजवृक्षरीत्या ॥’ इति ।

तदा चाणक्यः राक्षसमाह—‘किं चन्दनदासस्य जीवितं भवता  
इष्यते’ इति । राक्षस आह—‘कः सन्देहः ? अवश्यम् इष्यते  
चन्दनदासजीवितम्; तदर्थमेवाहप्रागतः ।’ चाणक्य आह—‘पदि  
चन्दनदासेन जीवितव्यम् तर्हि साधिष्यचिह्नं शङ्खं गृह्यताम्; पदि  
न गृह्यते तर्हि मृतश्चन्दनदासः’ इति । इत्थं चाणक्योक्तं निशम्य  
राक्षसः स्वोपकारिचन्दनदासस्योदपरपशः कथञ्चिच्छत्रमग्रहीत् ।  
साधितकार्यं दद्याणक्यः नितान्तं तुतोष । चन्द्रगुप्तश्च खं कृतार्थः ।  
ममन्यत । ततश्च मद्रमटमागुरायणप्रभृतिभिः संयमितकर-  
चरणः मलयकेतुः द्वारभूमिं नीत इति कश्चित् पुरुष आगत्य  
चाणक्यं निवेदयति, चाणक्यः पुरुषं प्रत्याह—‘नाहमिदानी-  
ममात्यः, किन्तु राक्षसोऽमात्यः, तस्मै विज्ञापय’ इति ।  
ततश्च पुरुषेण विज्ञापितो राक्षसः चन्द्रगुप्तं निवेदयामास—  
‘राजन् चन्द्रगुप्त ! कञ्चित्कालं यत् मलयकेतुकटके उपित-  
यन्तः; अतो मदर्थं भवता मलयकेतुः संरक्ष्यः’ इति । इत्थं  
मुक्तश्चन्द्रगुप्तः चाणक्यमुद्यमद्राक्षीत् । चाणक्योऽपि राक्षस-  
सन्तोषाय पुरुषं प्रत्यभाषीत्—‘अमात्यराक्षसेन विज्ञापितो राजा  
मलयकेतवे पिङ्गं राष्ट्रं प्रदिशति, तद्गच्छतु मलयकेतुः स्वकं

विषयम् । भद्रभट्टप्रमुखाश्च मलयकेतुना गत्वा तं प्रतिष्ठाप्य  
 राक्ष्ये पुनरागच्छन्तु' इति । तथेति गच्छन्तं पुरुषं चाणक्यः  
 पुनरपि समादिशत्—“राक्षसप्रियत(या) चन्द्रगुप्तः समाधापयति  
 'य एष श्रेष्ठी चन्दनदासः स पृथिव्यां सर्वनगरेषु श्रेष्ठिपदमारो-  
 प्यताम्' इति विजय दुर्गपाल भण' । तथेति निष्क्रान्तं पुरुष  
 पुनरपि चाणक्य आह—

‘विना घातनहस्तिभ्यो मुच्यतां सर्वबन्धनम् ।

तीर्णप्रतिज्ञेन मया बध्यते केशमञ्चयः ॥’ इति ।

इत्यमाशापिता भद्रभट्टप्रभृतयः मलयकेतुना सङ्ग निरक्रामन् ।  
 चन्दनदासश्च श्रेष्ठिपदमारोपितः । चाणक्यश्च पूर्वमुपका-  
 रिणा सर्वेषामपि यथायोग्यं राज्ञा सम्मानयित्वा तपश्चरित्  
 वनाय प्रनस्थे । राक्षसोऽपि स्वकलत्रपुत्रादिभिः समेतः स्वाधि-  
 व्यधुरमुद्रदन् राज्ञ उच्चरोत्तर हितमन्विष्यन् भुखमास्त । राजा  
 चन्द्रगुप्तोऽपि सार्वभौमस्सन् चतुस्सागरीमेखलां वसुधराम्  
 अपालयदिति सर्वं शिवम् ।

श्रीमद्वत्सकुलाम्बुशशिशिभिर्जीवेन तुल्यैर्धिया

काव्यालङ्कृतितन्त्रपट्कचतुरैरुद्यौतैः क्षमामण्डले ।

नीतिर्बोधयिता क्षमासुरमहादेयाख्यतीर्थैः कृतो

मुद्राराक्षसनाटकोदितकथाभागोऽगमत् पूरणम् ॥

(इति श्रीमहादेवकृता मुद्राराक्षसनाटककथा  
 सम्पूर्णा । )



## NOTES.

(Textual, Traditional and Historical).

---

*P. 1.* Pāṭalipura; also called Pāṭaliputra, Puṣpapura and Kusumapura; modern Patna. Pāṭali is a flower and hence the names Puṣpa or Kusuma pura. According to the Vāyupurāṇa, 99. 319, and the Jain work, Paṛiśiṣṭaparvan, of Hemacandra, 6. 180, the city was founded by Udayin or Udāyin, son of Darśaka or Kūṇika (Paṛiśiṣṭaparvan), king of Magadha. The Vāyupurāṇa says that Udayin founded Kusumapura in the fourth year of his reign, on the southern bank of the Ganges. The Paṛiśiṣṭaparvan says that the city was called Pāṭalipura after a Pāṭali tree on the Ganges which was taken as providing the most auspicious site for the new city. For the Brhatkathā story of the foundation of the city, as recorded in the Kathāsaritsāgara, I. iii, and the Brhatkathāmañjarī, pp 10-12, see the Introduction to this book

गृह. — 'गृहाः पुंसि तु भून्त्येव'—Amara; Gṛha, always neuter, appears in masculine also but only in plural then.

प्रमदालयनानामुन्नयः etc That the mansions of Pāṭaliputra were renowned is known from Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya, IV. 3.66 : पद्विषुन्नयः प्रमदाः,

पाटलिपुत्रा. प्रमदा इति । The following is the description of this opulent city by Arrian in Ch. X of his *Indica* :

"The largest city in India named Palimbothra (Pāṭaliputra) is in the land of the Prasians

(Prācyas-Easterners), where is the confluence of the river Erannaboas (Hiranyavāhā i.e., the Son) and the Ganges Megasthenes says that on one side where it is longest this city extends 80 stades (9½ miles) in length and that its breadth is 15 (1½ miles), that the city has been surrounded with a ditch in breadth 6 plethra (606 feet) and in depth 30 cubits, and that its wall has 570 towers and 64 gates. It is these multi-towered walls (Prākāras) of Pātaliputra that Patañjali refers to. Archers were mounted on these walls, there were also holes in the wall through which archers discharged arrows. The excavations at the site of Pātaliputra have shown portions of a wood made wall, at a depth of ten to fifteen feet below the surface.

सुवर्णं शीघ्रं — The wealth of the Nanda kingdom was proverbial in those days and reports of it reached Alexander. Tradition also speaks of the last Nanda as being called Dhana Nanda owing to his great craze for accumulating wealth. In the *Mudrārākṣasa nāṭaka* III 27, the Nandas are referred to as lords of 990 crores of gold. The *Kathāsaritsāgara* (I iv) and the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* (p 16) put the figure at 99 crores. According to the Buddhist work, *Mahāvamsatikā*, Dhana Nanda levied taxes even on skins, gums, trees and stones and amassed 80 crores. Mānūlanār, the Tamil Sangam poet refers to the untold wealth of the Nandas which was hidden underground near the Ganges and which was eventually swept away by the floods of the Ganges. According to the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* (p 10) and

four main quarters On the extent of the Nanda Kingdom, see below at the end सूतपुत्री—The Sūta is a mixed caste, devoted to the profession of charioteers and minstrels

*P 2* शूद्राया = सूतपुत्री मुराया Sūdrā here refers to the second wife Murā daughter of a Sūta whose subcaste is brought under the Sūdras

जलावृक्षवत्—like a bottle-gourd (जलावृक्षः) मांसकायः—a mass of flesh श्रेणी—vesel दुर्याधनन्दय etc For the story of the similar birth of Duryodhana and the other 99 sons of Dhritarāstra see Mahābhārata Adiparvan, ch 129 ślokaś 31—35, Kumbakonam edition इतिहास—epic, the Rāmāyana and the Mahābhārata are Itihāśas

*P 3* प्रतिभाक्वित—Pratibhā is imagination or genius शत्रुपुत्र—sons in the principles of polity शत्रुपुत्रा—equal to their father in intelligence दण्डनीतिः. Danda is one of the four divisions of Niti or royal polity, viz Sāman winning over by conciliation or peaceful settlement Dāna winning over or placating by gifts Bheda, success through the creation of splits among the enemies and Danda or actual war

नं दानं—मुराया जगत् पुमान् मयं तेन Historians dispute this derivation of the word Maurya from a mother Murā, and point out that grammatically Murā's son would be Maureva and not Maurya Other available evidences also do not point to one opinion on this question of Candragupta's descent and relation to Nanda Classical writers speak of Nanda

there was a literary court at Ujjain, there was a court of Śāstraic learning at Pātaliputra where Śāstrakāras were examined

थूयते च पाटलिपुत्रे शास्त्रमरपरीक्षा—

अत्रोपवर्षवर्षाविह पाणिनिपिगलाविह व्याडि ।

चरन्निपतञ्जली इह परीक्षिता ख्यातिमुपजग्मुः ॥

The Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa of the Buddhists mentions Pāṇini as a friend of the last Nanda, and the Buddhist work, Mahāvamśa Tīkā says that it was to have a learned disputation that Cānakya, after graduating at Taxila came to Pātaliputra and was insulted by the Nanda. In our version of the story too we find that every day the Nandas feasted Brāhmins and showed special honours to one among them who was a master of all the Śāstras. The Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa also records rather regretfully that Brahminical learning flourished greatly under Nanda and Candragupta. Vātsyāyana informs us (Kāmasūtra I 1 11) that Dattaka the great authority in the subject of Kāmasāstra wrote a special treatise on the subject in relation to the courtezans (Vaiśika) at the request of the courtezans of Pātaliputra रसिका —Men of taste तृणनीव—As if riches were no more than blades of grass अमरस—Heavenly courtezans like Menakā and Rambhā परगुणान् etc. By this, the Pātivratya or chastity of the women of that city is emphasised पटुतु— In the six seasons Vasanta (Spring) Grisma (Summer), Varsā (Rains), Śarat (Autumn), Hemanta and Śiśira (Winter or cold season) चतुस्त्रिमुद्र etc. The four oceans are those of the

four main quarters On the extent of the Nanda Kingdom, see below at the end सूतपुत्री—The Sūta is a mixed caste, devoted to the profession of charioteers and minstrels

*P 2* शूद्राया = सूतपुत्री मुराया Sūdrā here refers to the second wife Murā daughter of a Sūta whose subcaste is brought under the Sudra<sup>a</sup>

अलावृत्तम्—lko a bottle-gourd (अलावृत्तम्) मानस्य—<sup>a</sup> mass of fle h द्रोणि—<sup>a</sup> vessel दुर्योधनादय इति For the story of the similar birth of Duryodhana and the other 99 sons of Dhrtarāstra see Mahābhārata Adiparvan, ch 129 ślokas 31—35, Kumbakonam edition इतिहास—epic, the Rāmāyana and the Mahābhārata are Itihāsas

*P 3* प्रतिमान्वित—Pratibhā is imagination or genius प्रतिपु—in the principles of polity विनृत्या—equal to their father in intelligence दण्डनीतिः. Danda is one of the four divisions of Niti or royal polity viz, Sāman winning over by conciliation or peaceful settlement Dāna winning over or placating by gifts Bheda, success through the creation of splits among the enemies and Danda or actual war

माया—मुराया अथवा पुमान् मय्ये तेन Historians dispute this derivation of the word Maurya from a mother Murā, and point out that grammatically Murā's son would be Maureya and not Maurya Other available evidences also do not point to one opinion on this question of Candragupta's descent and relation to Nanda Classical writers speak of Nanda

as of humble origin and attribute to Nanda a very base parentage; the Jain versions also speak of Naada as base-born and Candragupta as born in a family of caretakers of peacocks (Mayūrapoṣaka); the Buddhistic versions assign Candragupta to a Kṣatriya tribe called Moriyas related to the Sākya and living originally near Nepal; the Kathāsaritsāgara calls Nanda a Śūdra and mentions Candragupta as his direct and only son; the Purāṇas seem to refer to the Nandas alone as Śūdras; Buddhistic works refer to Candragupta's son and grandson as Kṣatriyas; the Drama Mudrārākṣasa supports the version that Candragupta was a Kulahina as against the Nandas (II. 7), and that he was a grandson (son of Maurya) of the Nanda King (II. 6. 8). Some historians try to seek the support of the Drama for their view that Candragupta was of Gāndhāra origin and that he was not at all related to the Nandas; but the Drama is, more than once, expressly clear on Candragupta being a relation of the Nandas

न नन्दा.—The nine sons of Sarvārthasiddhi by by his first Kṣatriya wife Sunandā were known as Nandas. Some historians have contended that there were not nine of them and that the expression 'Nava Nandas' means the New Nandas; the Drama explicitly uses the word 'Nava' in a numerical sense.

गुह्यपुरम्—The non-Kṣatriya issues of a king were not qualified to succeed to the throne. गुह्यपुरम्—the capital Pāṭalipura. राज्यच्छिद्रम्—vulnerability of the state. मुद्रिकपाते—by the casting

of lots; guṭikās are small spherical pieces; the drawing of lots is also referred to as Śalākā-grahana. Śalākā being a rectangular piece of material used in the game of dice. The Buddhistic works have reference to settling of doubtful points by Śalākā-grahana. The Dāyabhāga of Jimūta-vāhana refers to the drawing of lots in the partition of property: “गुटिकं पातयित्वा व्यञ्जनं वा दायमानः ।”

P 4 एवं नानादयः etc It was with difficulty that Rākṣasa maintained the unity of authority in a kingdom headed by nine kings. In the Drama, Cānakya refers to the absence of unity when the Nandas ruled, despite the able ministers Vakranāsa and others, and speaks of his own achievement by which he unified the authority. Mudrārākṣasa I. 23. विक्रान्तेन्द्रराजिभिः सुखिदं न. वक्रनासदिभिः, नन्दे जीवन्ति वा तदा न गमिता स्वयं चत्वरः मुहुः । तमेन्द्रमुपागतान् etc.

नानादयः नैराधिक्यं ददा. The Nanda army was a formidable one. It was reported to Alexander that Xandrames (Nanda) had an army of 20,000 horse, 2,00,000 infantry, 2,000 chariots and 4,000 elephants; Porus confirmed the report.

शय्यम्—internal trouble; Śalya is the broken end of some missile which remains within the body and gives great pain. कालोचनशाला—counsel chamber. राक्षसादिभिर्मातुः—Besides Rākṣasa, there were other ministers too; one of them was known as Vakranāsa; see Mudrārākṣasa I. 23. The legends speak of a minister named Śakatāra prominently; but he is conspicuous by his absence in the Drama. Similarly Rākṣasa, so prominent according to the

Drama is not to be seen in the old Brāhminical Buddhist and Jain versions

पक्ष्य द्वासनम्—God's mandate प्रत्यपकार—revenge

P 5 प्रताकारम् revenge इतरथापि अस्माकं ध्व मरण सिद्धमेव तदर्थं भवतु तत्र को लाभः । Even if we do not elect to die today to morrow we are sure to die as there is food here for all of us for one day only le that death then be today itself what do we gain by dying to morrow instead of today ? चन्द्रगुप्त—the last of the hundred sons of Maurya नवमं तपुत्रै—with the ninety nine sons अनुग्रह—Having blessed दक्षिण्यरेव दिन—Despite the absence of food from the next day and consequent starvation their life lingered for a few days गत means मृत, passed away

In most of the legends this fate of being assigned to an empty well with hundred sons the daily supply of food for only one the sons agreeing to one person taking the food to live and wreak vengeance is mentioned as befalling a Nanda minister named Śakataḥ

पक्षम्—cage कविदुःखान्त In Rav Nartaka's version he is called Viśiḥa See Cāṇakya-kathā śloka 88 इदानीं तथा etc This sentence in the original manuscript did not have the word गतचिन्तया but such a word is presupposed by the word तथा in the manuscript and the passage in the Cāṇakya kathā which runs close to this text here

न हि मौर्यसुतश्चन्द्रगुप्त शिल्पकलानिधि ।

अमेचयिष्यत् पक्षस्य किं तथा गतचिन्तया । śl 89

supplied the word गतचिन्तया



P 6 रातन —the Nine Nandas मन्त्रितुरविकारम्—  
 मन्त्रितम् The office which your father was holding,  
 namely the command of the army निर्वन्धादिव —as if  
 under pressure अनुम—made of wax यन्त्रकृत चरन्म्—  
 the movement of the wax-lion was through a  
 mechanical arrangement कृत्रिमम्—artificial लव  
 शालशक्ति —with iron rods अद्वयत्—made it melt The  
 man who came with a cage and lion appeared  
 to challenge some one to drive the lion out of the  
 cage without breaking open the cage पारमर्शिक  
 वन्त स्थित सिद्ध वशिष्ठवदन्तु The word विद्रावन्तु means both  
 'let him drive out' and 'let him melt it', and  
 Candragupta who found out that the lion was  
 wax made understood also the pun in this word  
 विद्रावन्तु

In Anantabhatta's version, enemy kings send  
 a small rod and ask Nanda to find its base and  
 top, a Brahman who later becomes minister  
 Rāksasa, finds the base and top by putting the  
 rod in water

भोजनशालाविकारम्—charge of the dining hall where  
 everyday the Nandas feasted the Brahmanas तद्  
 कार्यमाश्रयम्—He was looking after that work

दर्भाद्वृक्ष —A sprout of Darbha grass तद्दर्भं ++  
 पतं In one version he pours buttermilk at the  
 root, sweet gruel is poured at the roots for ants  
 to gather and destroy the roots according to  
 another

P 7 अशुभम्—ten thousand शल —Sudra दुःखम्  
 Hunger शल इति त्वया वदुःखम् etc When Cānakya  
 requested to be excused for addressing the prince

Candragupta as Vrsala : e Sūdra Candragupta replied that the address Vrsala was itself a blessing This reply of Candragupta becomes more significant when we note that there may be a pun on the word Vrsala which according to some foreign language like the Greek then understood in those parts of North India means also the royal title Basileus Some historians have tried to prove this व्यक्तानुप्रसक्तया—leading from one connected topic to another मद्गङ्गा पवित्रीकरणम्—my residence too must be made holy by your visit

P 8 तस्मिन् विद्वान्—in that seat intended for a Brahman scholar versed in all the lores अश्वत्थु—beardless too young अग्ने—first seat अङ्गुल—haughty चमसदि—in that assemblage of people आसनादप्ययामासु Cf Drama I 12 गोचरोऽस्तर्नराधिपमयाद धिक्षादाम मुने मामप्रामनतोऽङ्गमवश य इत्यत पुरा ॥ IV 11 स्वासासनापनयनात्रिकृतिर्न सोढा ।

प्राजा निवध्रामि Cf Drama I तत प्राशनि मुक्ता शिला परं नृपमाणक्य । I 9 VII 17 प्रयत्नान्—swore सतीर्थम्—classmate

परेऽपरान्—king of a bordering non Indian people Some scholars try to identify this Parvata keśvara with the famous Porus who fought Alexander this is not likely for Porus though he lived at the time Candragupta was in the North West was soon treacherously murdered by a Greek Satrap Eudemos a circumstance which might have helped the growth of antipathy towards the Greek among the people and facilitated later Candragupta's conquest of the

N W The Buddhist work Mahāvamsā Tikā calls this ally of Cānakya, Pabbato

P 9 नन्दराजमर्मन् —one who knows the secrets of the Nanda kingdom सृष्ट्वा—making him his ally सनमत्रहम्—mobilisation of the forces क्षत्रान्वेषणी—putting on the guise of a Jain monk. नष्टिहम्—-in polity, ज्योतिषास्त्रे—in astrology, मन्त्रमास्त्रे—in incantations गार्हपत्येन—as a protege अतिचरादिहम्—black-magic etc भद्रव्यसि अस्मिन् मासे in this forthcoming month. इत्यम्—an evil Spirit मनुरगिच्छन्—a bunch of peacock feathers which some Jain monks and some magicians carry

P 10 गुह्यचरमुक्तेन—through secret spies द्रष्टुं विवृता—the disposition of the planets is perverse and malefic भद्रान्—soldiers चन्द्रप्रेषया—by Cānakya's (conscious and planned) negligence हन्त — unhurt दिव्यं न — died

According to the Milindapanhoo the Buddhists this battle between the Nandas and Candragupta-Kautilya was of the bloodiest kind The Nanda forces were commanded by one Bhaddasāla 100 crores of footmen, 10,000 elephants, 1 lakh horses and 5,000 chariots perished in this battle According to the Drama, (IV 12) and the Kathāsaritsāgara, Cānakya used black magic against the Nandas and killed them the battle was waged after that मृत्युं गता—died अस्माकं विवृतादिभिरात्मैः

Cf Mudrārāksasa V 20 पुत्रेभ्य इतद्वान्ता कृषिना येषां न मितं वयम् ।

P 11 चतुर्थोपादन—by the fourth expedient namely war—मृत्युननुयामि २१+स्त्रीवृत्तिगमन—Cf. the

Drama V 24 किं भर्तृनुयामि जीवति रिषां स्त्रीणामिय योग्यता ।  
 वृत्तदूष्यम्—ancestor, the oldest member of the family  
 भर्तृपिण्डानृष्यम्—freeing oneself of the obligations one  
 owes to the master whose salt one had eaten  
 पयतकश्चरराक्षसयोश्च दिशिष्य मत्वा सजाता On the friendship  
 between Rāksasa and Parvatākāśvara Cf Drama  
 V 7 मित्रं समदमिति निर्वृतचित्तवृत्तिं विश्रभतस्त्वयि निवर्तितसमर्थम् ।  
 तत निराह्य etc ॥ राक्षसं बुद्ध्या निवृत्य—knowing the inten-  
 tion and coming to a decision, बुद्ध्या in the manus-  
 cript may be बुद्ध्या determining with his intellect  
 what the intention of Rāksasa is शोधयित्वा—after  
 examining, and clearing the city of all those  
 dangers Śodhana is technically used in the  
 science of polity to mean the clearing away of  
 enemies and other dangers, compare the phrase  
 राज्यशोधनम्, उग्रता—by some ruse

P 12 राक्षसगणान्तं चारमुनेन शोधयन्—scouting and  
 scrutinising the activities of Rāksasa through his  
 spies दिक्कन्या—a female spirit or a female of a  
 poisonous nature whose contact kills people

P 18 'निष्पन्नं प्रसूतं गो रक्षसं ग वानरम्' is a proverb  
 meaning 'Beginning to do a desired thing and  
 ending by doing quite an undesirable thing,' as  
 for instance starting on the production of the deity  
 Ganeśa and in the end, producing actually a  
 monkey. Here in the story, Rāksasa planned to  
 kill Candragupta his enemy but it turned out that  
 thereby his friend Parvatākāśvara died प्रसूतम्—  
 dead निष्पन्नं दृष्ट्वा Cāṇakya pretended to be dejected,  
 for it was he who actually planned the death of  
 Parvatākāśvara at the hands of the Viśvakanyakā

*P. 14.* 'मक्षितेऽपि उज्जुने न शान्तो व्याधिः' is a proverb meaning that even after resorting to an antidote of a reproachful nature, the malady has not been put down. Laṣuna is garlic which religiously minded people do not take; one takes it at the suggestion of a doctor as the remedy for some ailment, but to his regret he finds the ailment uncured, the only outcome being his transgression of the prohibition of eating garlic. Here, in the context, Parvatakeśvara the ally and friend was killed by Cānakya by turning Rāksasa's Visakan-yakā against him; the purpose was the elimination of one who would claim half of the kingdom according to the promise; now the sin of having killed a friend has been committed, but the expected release from the obligation to part with half the kingdom did not come, for Parvata-keśvara's son and brother, Malayaketu and Vairodhaka were there to claim the share. प्रतिधुतम्—promised.

नगुरायण—Bhāgurāyana is one of the important persons who joined Candragupta in his conflict with the Nandas and became prominent with Candragupta's success (Pradhānapurusa and Sahot-thāyin); he was the younger brother of the commander Simhabala: सेनपते. सिंहबलस्य कर्णायान् भ्राता मायुरायणः Mudrārākṣasa, Act III, p. 172. कृतघ्नः—one ungrateful विदग्ध—confidence. 'जीवन् भद्राणि पश्यन्ति' is a saying, meaning that if instead of courting death or risking life, one in adversity manages to hold to life, times may change and many good things may happen to him स्वराष्ट्रम्—the

Mleccha kingdom in the North West वैरनिर्माणोपद — way of wreaking vengeance

P 15 प्रत्यर्थापान्—promised समित्—one who knows पञ्चराजन्—the five kings under Malayaketu's control except probably the Malaya all the other four countries are in the West and North West, Kuluta was in the valley of the Beas, Kaśmīra Sindhū and Pārasika are well known The North West of India was at that time full of republics According to the evidence of the Greek writers Candragupta had offended the Nanda King and was taking refuge in the North West, he met Alexander he collected a band of fighters from among the people of the North West and attacked Pataliputra The Buddhistic version tells us that Cānakya was a student of Taxila in the North West in the first attack on Pataliputra Cānakya and Candragupta failed and the Jain and the Buddhistic versions say that Cānakya and Candragupta learnt a lesson from an old woman that the surrounding country must first be captured before one could take the capital and that they did likewise विषयहस्त्यश्वादिदम्—the territory, elephants horses etc प्रोत्साहनम्—enthusing encouragement मित्रिन मूलधाराय—artists architects and carpenters दत्तै—by the astrologers परेष्मन्—must be decorated

परितेजदिरचिन—worked with designs of rows of pure pearls विचित्ररङ्ग—cloth of variegated colour. रत्निसद—gem—set अपवारण—upper garment. द्वन्द्वक—two garlands thrown rightwise and loftwise across the shoulders, producing a cross design on the chest. उपाश्रिणी—she who bears. दशा—a female elephant. राजद्वेजिन—by the royal retinue सज्जीकृतम्—adjusted, made ready घन्ततोरणम्—arch manipulated by a mechanical arrangement. निवृहीतवाहेषु with their horses held up निवासी—Mahout on the elephant

P 17. कनकदण्डिकान्तर्हिताम्—hidden within the golden staff. अस्तिपुत्रिका—slender sword. शृङ्खला—chain. मेखला—belt जपनामिघातम्—a blow on the hind parts. गतिभेदम्—a different gait. प्रथमगतानुरोधप्रत्यावर्तितमुच्यते—adjusted and released to emit the original gait of the elephant प्रप्रलक्ष्यम्—out of the target-range घन्त-घटनलोहकीटम्—the iron rod fastening the machine-arch. नैक—अनेक अनुमारम्—even as an animal would be beat to death. प्रणयी—friend कनकभाजने वर्णान्तरम् etc. The medicine being poisonous produced a chemical reaction in the golden vessel. पयितः—made to drink अतिष्ठम्—given.

P. 18 वद्व्यभेदान्—conflicting statements or changing the explanations विचित्ररूपेण—by torture. सुरङ्गा—an underground passage पुरुषगर्भम्—having men hidden inside.

आप्तुदमान्—reliable friends प्रणिघोन्—spies अभियोगं प्रति—in the matter of attacking.

P. 19 पारलौकिकम्—obsequial rites intended for welfare in the other world. महाहानि—highly valuable कटकम्—camp. महार्थानि—highly valuable नन्दं नन्दे—in his treasury

Mleccha kingdom in the North West वैरनिर्वाणनेत्रायः—  
ways of wreaking vengeance

*P. 15* प्रत्यधीषीत्—promised अभिज्ञः—one who knows पञ्च राजानः—the five kings under Malayaketu's control ; except probably the Malaya, all the other four countries are in the West and North West ; Kulūta was in the valley of the Beas ; Kāśmīra, Sindhu and Pārasika are well-known The North West of India was at that time full of republics. According to the evidence of the Greek writers, Candragupta had offended the Nanda King and was taking refuge in the North West ; he met Alexander; he collected a band of fighters from among the people of the North West and attacked Pāṭaliputra The Buddhistic version tells us that Cāṇakya was a student of Taxila in the North West ; in the first attack on Pāṭaliputra, Cānakya and Candragupta failed and the Jain and the Buddhistic versions say that Cānakya and Candragupta learnt a lesson from an old woman that the surrounding country must first be captured before one could take the capital, and that they did likewise विषयहस्त्यधादिकम्—the territory, elephants, horses etc प्रोत्साहनम्—enthusing, encouragement क्षिप्तिनः नूतनकाराग्र—artists, architects and carpenters दंष्ट्रैः—by the astrologers. परिष्करणं—must be decorated.



परमेन्द्रिरनिन—worked with designs of rows of pure pearls चिह्नस्त—cloth of variegated colour रत्न—gem—set उपधारण—upper garment बन्धन—two garlands thrown rightwise and leftwise across the shoulders producing a cross design on the chest जगन्माता she who bears दशा—a female elephant राजद्वार—by the royal retinue सज्जितम्—adjusted, made ready मन्त्रतारणम्—arch manipulated by a mechanical arrangement निरुद्धातदाह्वु with their horses held up निग्राही—Mahont on the elephant

P 17 कनकदण्डिकान्तर्हिताम्—hidden within the golden staff लघुशस्त्रम्—slender sword शृङ्खला—chain मेढरा—belt जपननिषत्तम्—a blow on the hind parts गतिभेदम्—a different gait प्रथमतस्तुरोधप्रत्यक्षमुक्तम्—adjusted and released to suit the original gait of the elephant प्रवृत्तक्षेत्रम्—out of the target-range यन्त्र-पट्टादिकम्—the iron rod fastening the machine arch नैक—एव यजुमारम्—even as an animal would be beat to death प्रणयि—friend कनकभास्वने वर्णान्तरम् etc The medicine being poisonous produced a chemical reaction in the golden vessel पायित—made to drink अनिमृष्टम्—given

P 18 वदन्तिभेदम्—conflicting statements or changing the explanations विचित्ररथेन—by torture सुरङ्ग—an underground passage पुरुषगर्भम्—having men hidden inside

वृत्तपुत्रान्—reliable friends प्रणिधान्—spies अभिज्ञानं—in the matter of attacking

P 19 पारलौकिकम्—obsequial rites intended for welfare in the other world महार्थि—highly valuable शिवम्—camp महार्थि—highly valuable —in his treasury

यमपत्रम् — The Yamapata is a scroll containing paintings of pictures of the horrors of hell to be undergone for the respective sins. In ancient India a class of mendicants and beggars went about the streets and houses exhibiting this scroll and singing songs exhorting people to avoid such sins and practice Dharma. मणिकारधेष्टी—the chief of the jeweller community धर्मगीतानि—songs exhorting people to observe Dharma पञ्चवर्षदय—about five years old अपवरकान्—from an inner apartment

P 20. कुमारसरोध—*in the act of restraining the boy* पुष्पाङ्गुलिप्रमाणवदित्ता—*made to the size of a man's finger* मुद्रिका—*ring* This is the ring of Rākṣasa with which he is finally captured and which thus gives the title to the play Mudrārūkṣasa न्यासोद्वह—*having placed in trust* विविध पत्रम्—*some letter* For the contents of this letter and the part it plays see pp 30-3 of the text अक्षतवाचनानाम्—*without the address*

P 21 दक्षिणाक्षिसंज्ञेयवृत्तम्—a hint by the winking of the right eye सनेत—*secret understanding* वर्ण वन्यर्थ कथयमाय—*For this and the part Siddhārthaka plays, see pp 30-4 of the text* वक्तव्यम्—*denial* दुर्गपाम्—*The person in charge of the fort, and probably of prison also, his proper name is Vijaya, see below p 40*

P 22 गृहीतगृहसम्—with the valuables in his house confiscated

office of Mahāpratihāra ; वल्लुप्त is a Mahārāja by title and a kinsman of Candragupta ; राजसेन is a companion of Candragupta since his boyhood ; रोहिताश्व is the son of the Mālwa king ; विजयवर्मन् is the chief of a military group, Kṣatragaṇa ; all these are leaders and partisans of Candragupta who rose to power with him See Drama p. 172, Act III.

शार्ङ्गराजि—I shall round up. आहितुष्टिकः—A snake-charmer.

*P. १३.* भाण्डागारे—in the treasury. उत्क्रांतिनोदार्ढम्—to console herself in her longing.

*P. २४.* स्वस्य अनन्तराधिकारे—in an authority next to himself. चाणक्यारणेण—as a result of antipathy towards Cāṇakya. त्वया अभिनेतव्यम्—You must act as if you transgress my command.

*P. ३५.* कौमुदीमहोत्सवः—The festival of moonlight celebrated during the fullmoon night of the Kārttika month in Sarat or autumn. This may be the festival called Kaumudijāgara mentioned in the Kāmasūtras of Vātsyāyana I. 4.42 and which the commentary Jayamaṅgalā says fell on the fullmoon day in the Āśvayuk month in Śarat. People give themselves up to gaiety with song dance, etc. on the occasion. अर्थशास्त्रकाराः—authors of works on the science of polity. सिद्धिम्—success. राजव्यक्ताम्—dependent on the king. सचिवायत्तसिद्धिः—one whose success is dependent on his minister. वैतालिकः—bard. उपलोकितवान्—sung a verse of praise. प्रयोगः—manoeuvre. अर्थोत्सर्गः—gift of money. निरुद्धचेद्यप्रसरस्य—one the progress of whose activity is obstructed.

सयम् अनभिमुत्तानाम्—for those who do not exert themselves

*P 26* राक्षसोपदेशप्रवृत्ति—intent upon doing according to Rāksasa's advice व्यावामदा—time for military exercise दुर्गसिस्वार—improvements to the fortifications स्वयं हस्ते दत्तं स्वात्—we would ourselves have accepted the guilt

*P 27* खानिनि—in his masters, the Nandas प्रज्ञापुरयकाराभ्याम्—with intellectual capacity and capacity for manly action बोधदान्—having money अन्तर्क्षोभम्—internal revolution न दुर्गमम्—not difficult to tackle प्रशस्त्यार—more praiseworthy. द्रव्यरस—the remaining and unexpressed part of the sentence अविस्तृभना—unboastful

*P 28* रक्षम्—haughty सयत—imprisoned सद्भात—may come to peace

*P 29* मागधगन्धारचदनादीन् The army comprised Māgadhas, Gāndharas and Yavanas besides Khasas Sakas Cinas and Hūnas Cf Drama V 11 p 245 सेनामुखम्—forefront of the army व्यवस्था—arrangement निर्वासित—banished

*P 30* रक्षणाय राजद्वेष्य प्रवृत्ति—The very purpose of the intrigues is to secure Rāksasa for service under Candragupta, and hence Bhāgurāyana is careful that Rāksasa's life is not endangered during the progress of the intrigues गुल्मस्थानधिष्ठित—in charge of a division of the army occupying a post or position वर्तमानम्—owing to the importance of the business योऽपि refers to Rāksasa वयमपि पुरुषम् refers to Candragupta वयमत्रतिष्ठाम् refers to Cānakya उपपन्नमर्थिनम्—with whom we had entered into an understanding

*P. 31.* पूर्वप्रतिष्ठित—what had been already promised to them; the things promised are set forth below, viz treasury, elephants and territory. स्वाश्रय—refers to Malayaketu अलङ्कार-नम् refers to the ornaments of Parvatakeśvara which Candragupta presented to the three Brahmans, Viśvāvasu etc, and which the latter managed to sell to Rākṣasa: see p 19 of the text above. अश्रुत्यर्थे निदिष्ट—something as compliment to the letter; refers to the ornaments which Malayaketu had given as presents to Rākṣasa, which Rākṣasa gave as presents to Siddhārthaka for delivering Śakaṭadāsa from the executioners, and which Siddhārthaka sealed with Rākṣasa's ring and kept in safe custody in Rākṣasa's own treasury, so that he might use them when necessary, Siddhārthaka uses them now against Rākṣasa पत्रिण्—oral message; for this, see below. This is the letter which Cāṇakya planned and wrote, got copied in the hand of Śakaṭadāsa the friend of Rākṣasa, sealed with Rākṣasa's ring and gave to Siddhārthaka with a secret direction for using it at the proper time against Rākṣasa; see pp 20.1 of the text above. कदिष्ट—box अश्रुत्यर्थे—security from danger. पराधीनस्य—a dependent

*P. 33.* कसिदिष्ट परिशेष्यने—for some act which gave me satisfaction. अनिदिष्टिणम्—a sample of his handwriting.

tructed as जीवसिद्धिनाम तस्य आख्यामासतुः । When Rākṣasa denied that he sent the Viṣakanyā against Parvatakeśvara, Malayaketu and Bhāgurāyaṇa mentioned to him the name Jīvasiddhī, thereby showing him that they were in the know of the person who gave him the Viṣakanyā and what that person Jīvasiddhī and Rākṣasa together did हृदयमपि—When Rākṣasa found that even Jīvasiddhī whom he had considered and confided in as a bosom friend had been in contact with his enemy, he concluded that even his heart had been captured by his foes. विश्वम्भघाती—a breaker of confidence, a betrayer and traitor. समाधीयता चन्द्रगुप्तः—join Candragupta क्षीणमिदं चेष्टितम्—One should avenge the wrongs if he is a man ; to commit suicide is to act like women who are impotent.

P. 35. सङ्गसप्तः—with sword as ally चन्दन-  
दासमोक्षरभगम—impatient to rescue Candanadāsa  
जीर्णोद्यानम्—an old dilapidated garden in the out-  
skirts of a city. सेनाया व्याप्य स्थिताः—had spread them-  
selves all over the army. भस्मिप्रवेशम्—giving up  
one's life by entering the flames. संप्रदिनिमदेन—by  
giving the price of money.

P. 36. अवर्याय—having concealed सशयेन—as  
the man knew that only Rākṣasa, the great friend  
of Candanadāsa, could make that offer, he had the  
doubt that the person may be Rākṣasa himself ;  
to assure himself, he asked him who he was.  
वेगति refers to Siddhārtaka अग्रमन्त्रा—vigilant.

नयं निर्दिशकः; etc As the executioners had  
once been put to death previously for neglect of duty

and as the executioners are therefore said to be very careful, this is not the time for me to rescue Candanadāsa by resorting to my sword and valour, for, at the very sight of an armed person, even from a distance, they will immediately execute Candanadāsa निष्क्रान्त—recompense

P 86 समाधानम्—consolation निर्मलस्यमानम्—being rebuked परिभ्रष्टोदाहृत—subjected to humiliation मृत्युलोकादय—<sup>the</sup> passage leading to the world of death वन्यस्रग्—garland of a particular flower, viz Karavira, which is thrown on the criminal to be executed as a mark of capital sentence तद्व्यापारितेकस्यचुवनम्—imitating a part of your act Candanadāsa had offered to give up his life to protect Rāksasa and his family from the king, Rāksasa now says that he offers to give up his own life saving Candanadāsa's, and in his great esteem for the sacrifice of Candanadāsa, compares his offer to a meagre imitation of his friend's great act

मानदमन्—In ancient India the execution ground was near the crematorium, candālas or untouchables were in charge of the execution as of the crematorium द्वारिक—door-keeper

P 88 वाक्—mine शुभं न परितुष्यन् etc Being his envious enemies, we are not able to be pleased at his qualities, or though his envious enemies (ममरिणः) we can never be sufficiently pleased at his endowments प्रत्यनय—<sup>for</sup> convincing him or making him believe मन्त्र—a Jain monk refers to Jivāviddhī (Induśarman) वेष्टिन—refers to Candanadāsa पैतृक—come down from father or

ancestors hereditary शुद्धन —one whose manou-  
vres were free from mistakes

*P 39* अद्रव्यम्—improper person वर्णाश्रय—  
with his support worn out तीरवृक्षरक्षा—in the  
same manner as a tree on a water bank which  
falls down the ground at its roots having been  
slowly washed away by the water The unsuitable  
person chosen as support is compared to the  
waterside ground the reference is to Malayaketu

*P 40* सावित्र्यचिह्नम्—emblem of being the  
minister पुरुष आगत्य चाणक्य निवेदयति is a locative absolute  
पुरुषे च निवेदयति सति । पित्र्यम्—that which belonged to  
his father

सर्वनगरेषु धष्टिदम्—The Śresthin is a leader or  
chief of the merchant guild Candanadāsa was  
already a Śresthin of the jeweller community of  
Patalipura now he is made the chief of the  
jeweller guilds in the whole Mauryan Kingdom  
In the Daśakumāracarita of Dandin (Apahāravar-  
man's story) there is a reference to a boon or  
concession conferred by Maurya i.e., Candragupta  
on the merchant community (Vanika) abolishing  
capital punishment for them

मैयदत्तवर एष वणिजाम्, ईदृशेन्द्रारोपेन्द्यामरदियोग ।

If we are to rely on and set much store by  
the part played by the chief merchant of the city  
of Patalipura Candanadasa as also on this honour  
conferred on him in the end as told in the Drama  
we may also take Dandin's reference to mean that  
the occasion for this honour was also attended by  
not only amnesty for all (as is ordered by Canakya



in VII. 17), but also by the abolition of capital punishment for merchants; not only was Candana-dāsa the Sreṣṭhin who was condemned to death set free, but his whole community was decreed to be free from capital sentence for all time.

विना बाधनहस्तिभ्य etc There is a pun here on सर्वन्यपन्न, bandhana meaning imprisonment as well as roping to a post as in the case of horses and elephants. A further pun on the word is made in the second line where Bandha refers to Cāṇakya tying up his loose tuft

बाणम्यध + + तद्वारेण दनाय गन्तव्ये While the Jain Brhatkathākośa mentions a story of Cāṇakya's eventual renunciation, the Jain Pāriśataparvan and the Buddhistic Arya Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa record a tradition that Cāṇakya continued as a minister under Candragupta's son Bindusāra too

मार्गेर्मानः—emperor According to the report made to Alexander, the powerful Nanda Kingdom of Pāṭalipura comprised the entire East and the Gangetic region (the Gangaridae [Gaṅgarāstra] and the Prassi [Prācyas]) From the Hāthigumpha Inscription of Kharavela, we know that Nanda rule extended to Kāśī. Late Mysore inscriptions remember Nanda sway over Southern regions too. When Candragupta destroyed the Nandas, he became the emperor not only over these regions, but also over the North-west and further territories in the South. Plutarch says (Lives—Ch LXII) “Not long afterwards, Androcottos (Candragupta) who had at that time mounted the

throne presented Seleukos with 500 elephants and overran and subdued the whole of India with an army of 600,000." There is a reference in Tamil literature (Māmūlanār, Aham) to the forces of the Moriyas invading the South to subdue the king of Mōhūr, cutting their way across the mountains, and being helped in this invasion by the local Kośar and Vaḍukar. That Western India (Surāstra) was made a Mauryan province is proved by Rudradāman's Girnar Rock Inscription. In the North-west, Candragupta defeated Seleukos who, by a treaty with Candragupta, ceded to the latter Kandahar, Kabul and Baluchistan. The references to distant North-western, Western and Southern Kings in the Asokan rock edicts also confirm this vastness of the empire over which Candragupta became Sārvabhauma or emperor.

धर्मद्रुत्सकुलान्दुराशिसमि —one who was like the moon to the ocean of the Vasta gotra, i.e., one who made that line increase or joyous by his appearance. ज्ञानेन तुल्यविद्या—equal to Bṛhaspatī in intellect तन्त्रपट्टक—the six Darśanas Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, Sāṃkhya-Yoga and the Pūrva and Uttara Mimāṃsās नीतैर्व्यवस्था goes with क्याभागः—-which instructs one in the subject of polity. धर्मासुर-महादेवाख्यतीर्थैः—by the Brāhman Mahādevatīrtha. मुद्राराक्षसनाटकोदितकथाभागः—-the story told in the drama Mudrārāksasa (of Viśākhaḍatta). क्याभागः means the bare story.

---

## Alphabetical Index of and Notes on the Names in the Story

*Abhayadatta* —The royal physician at Pāṭalīpura, an agent of Rāksasa, administers a poisoned medicine to Candragupta, Cānakya detects the poison by the change of colour in the golden vessel of the medicine, is made to drink his own poisoned medicine and die

*Indusarman* —A classmate of Cānakya proficient in polity, astrology and incantation, assumes the guise of a Jain monk and the pseudonym Jivasiddhi and makes himself a great friend of Rāksasa for fifth column activity on behalf of Cānakya, cultivates also the friendship of the Nanda commanders, forecasts a trouble to them on a particular day, himself raises an evil spirit that day, and puts it down prevents the commanders from going to the battle against Cānakya and Candragupta by informing them individually that the day of the battle was fatally malefic towards them creates the Viśakanyā to be directed against Candragupta by Rāksasa but by whom Parvatakeśvara is killed, after Rāksasa's flight from the city, is banished by Cānakya for creating the Viśakanyā, joins Rāksasa, when the forces of Malayaketu and Rāksasa are near Pāṭalīpura for attacking Candragupta, deserts Rāksasa, after poisoning Malayaketu's mind that it was at Rāksasa's instance that he had raised the Viśakanyā to kill his father Parvatakeśvara and that he is deserting now because Rāksasa the

great expert in polity is beginning to do something like that again.

*Karabhaka* :—A spy of Rākṣasa who brings him news of the difference between Cānakya and Candragupta over the Kaumudīmahotsava and the announcement by Candragupta that, independent of Cānakya, he is himself carrying on his royal duties.

*Candanadāsa* :—A big merchant of Pāṭalipura; chief of the merchant guild of the city; dearest friend of Rākṣasa with whom the latter leaves his family while leaving the city; a spy of Cānakya, Nipuṇaka by name, finds out that he is harbouring Rākṣasa's family; is pressed by Cānakya to surrender Rākṣasa's family; but refuses to do so; knowing that any sacrifice to which he is forced will surely bring Rākṣasa to save him, Cānakya has him condemned to death; Cānakya's plan succeeds and Rākṣasa coming to know of Candanadāsa going to the gallows on his behalf rushes to his side and rescues him by paying the price of taking office under Candragupta; to gratify Rākṣasa, Cānakya orders that Candanadāsa be made the chief of all the merchants of the kingdom

*Candragupta*.—Last son of Maurya, the Sūdrāputra of King Sarvāthasiddhi of Pāṭalipura; nephew of the Nine Nandas; promises in the underground cellar to take vengeance on the Nine Nandas and survives his father and brothers: is brought out of the underground cellar to try his wit for solving the wnx-lion puzzle; is entrusted

with the supervision of the dining hall; meets Cāṇakya and with his aid wreaks his vengeance against the Nine Nandas; is made emperor by Cāṇakya; Rākṣasa plans many attempts on his life, but finally surrenders and becomes his minister.

*Candralekhā*.:—The She-slephant of Candragupta; to give the impression that Candragupta himself was going in, Cāṇakya makes Vairodhaka enter the palace riding on this slephant; her mahout is Barbaraka, an agent of Rākṣasa; he draws a sword concealed in his golden staff to strike at Candragupta; Candralekhā mistakes that her mahout was going to give her a blow on the back with the staff and takes to a speedy gait; the mechanical arch contrived by Dāruvarman and adjusted to fall on the riding king falls on Barbaraka at her back.

*Cāṇakya*.:—A Southern Brahman of surpassing intellect, learning and anger; comes to the dining hall of the Nandas; meets Candragupta who is on duty there and who narrates to him his story and the wrong done to him and his family by the Nandas; is dragged away from the first seat in the dining hall which he occupies and is thus insulted by the Nandas, for which he swears to destroy them; with Candragupta and Parvatakeśvara, an ally, destroys the Nandas; the whole story is a description of how he makes Candragupta the king, saves him from Rākṣasa's attempts on his life, foils Rākṣasa's plans to uproot him with the aid of Malayaketu, and

finally makes Rāksasa himself accept the minister's office under Candragupta; in the end retires to the forest for penance.

*Citravarman*.—King of the Kulūtas; a friend of Parvatakeśvara; one who fights on the side of Parvatakeśvara and later is on the side of Malayaketu; implicated in the letter which Cānākya writes and uses against Rāksasa to show to Malayaketu that Rāksasa and the five kings Citravarman etc are Candragupta's agents and hence, along with the four other kings, is ordered by Malayaketu to be executed

*Jivasidhi* (*Kṣapaṇaka*). See Induśarman

*Dingarāta*.—According to the Drama, the nephew of Candrabhānu the Mahāpratihāra; plays the same part as Bhadrabhata; see Bhadrabhata below. Mss of the Drama read his name variously as Dindirāta, Hingurāta and so on

*Dāruvarman*.—An architect of Pāṭalipura; an agent of Rāksasa instructed by Rāksasa to do away with Candragupta by some means, devices a machine arch gateway to be let down to kill Candragupta when the latter enters the palace; Cānākya smells the danger from Dāruvarman and sends Vairodhaka at the time appointed for Candragupta's entry; the elephant on which Vairodhaka was riding takes to a faster gait and the arch falls and kills Barharaka the mahout; noting this miscarriage, Dāruvarman plucks an iron rod fastening the arch and kills Vairodhaka: upon this, Vairodhaka's retinue stones Dāruvarman to death.

*Dirghacaksus* —A warden in charge of an outpost (Gulmasthāna) in Rākṣasa-Malayaketu camp captures Siddhārthaka with a letter bearing Rākṣasa's seal, going out without obtaining the permit seal

Mss of the Drama read his name variously as Dirgharaksa, Dirghaṅgha and Dirghavakṣa

*Durgapāla or Vijaya (Pāla)* —An executive officer under Candragupta, when Candanadāsa proves stubborn, Cānākya sends orders to him to bind over Candanadāsa, in the end again, he sends word to him that Candanadāsa is to be made chief of the merchants of the entire realm

Mahādeva refers to him as Durgapāla on p 21 and as Durgapāla Vijaya on p 40 Mss of the Drama are very confusing in their readings in both these portions, and we do not know whether Durgapāla and Vijayapāla are two persons, or whether Durgapāla is the official designation and Vijaya (pāla) is his proper name, in some Mss the name is found as Vijaya only, according to Mahādeva, Vijaya is the proper name of the Durgapāla

*Dhanasena* —A member of Candanadāsa's household, when Cānākya sends for him, Candanadāsa sees that Rākṣasa's family hiding in his house is evacuated secretly somewhere by him

*Nata Nandas* —The nine sons of king Sarvārthasiddhi by his Kṣatriya wife Sunandā, are first delivered as a mass of flesh, Rākṣasa brings them into human form by keeping them in ghee cans,

they and Rākṣasa are greatly attached, but are jealous and suspicious of their half brother, Maurya, and his hundred sons; contrive to imprison Maurya and his sons in an underground hall and thus earn the enmity of Maurya's youngest son Candragupta; in the lion-test proposed by a king, bring Candragupta out and entrust him with the supervision of the dining hall; honour everyday a hundred ordinary Brahmans and one great Brahman scholar; insult Cāṇakya in the dining hall and pay the penalty of death in the battle waged against them by Cāṇakya, Candragupta Parvatakeśvara.

*Nipuṇaka* :—A spy of Cāṇakya; he puts on the guise of the beggar who carries a scroll depicting scenes of hell, and sings songs exhorting people to observe Dharma and avoid hell; in this guise he goes to Candanadāsa's house; a boy comes out eager to see him; a lady from inside hastens to drag the boy in; in that act of hers, a rather loose ring on her finger falls down unnoticed and the spy secures it; from the name Rākṣasa on it, he detects the information that Rākṣasa has left his family in Candanadāsa's house; conveys the signet ring and the information to Cāṇakya who is just then thinking of how to capture Rākṣasa; Cāṇakya decides to capture Rākṣasa with that signet ring of the latter; Cāṇakya's fake letter is sealed with that ring, so that when Siddhārthaka tries to go out of Rākṣasa's camp and is caught with that letter, Malayaketu takes it as a genuine letter of Rākṣasa; Siddhārthaka takes the ring with him when he goes to



Rākṣasa's camp with Śakaṭadāsa; Śakaṭadāsa bundles the ornaments presented to him by Rākṣasa for rescuing Śakaṭadāsa, and seals them with Rākṣasa's ring; Śakaṭadāsa is given the ring and the authority to use it as the seal of permit in Rākṣasa's camp; the seal of Rākṣasa on the letter and ornaments involve Rākṣasa completely in a charge of treacherous private pact with Candragupta and lead to his abandonment by Malayaketu.

Mudrā in the title of the play refers to this ring which plays such an important part in the capture of Rākṣasa.

*Parvatakeśvara*:—A Mleccha chief whose alliance Cāṇakya seeks and with the aid of whose army and the armies of whose subordinates, Cāṇakya and Candragupta succeed in taking Pāṭalipura; Cāṇakya promises to give him half of the kingdom for the aid; is won over by Rākṣasa's intrigue; with the Visakanyā sent by Rākṣasa against Candragupta, Cāṇakya gets him eliminated; his ornaments are sold to Rākṣasa and are effectively used by Cāṇakya to show Rākṣasa as being in secret pact with Candragupta; is the father of Malayaketu.

*Puraṣadatta*:—According to the play, is the commander of cavalry; plays the same part as Bhadrabhaṭa; see below Bhadrabhaṭa.

*Puṣkarākṣa*:—King of Kashmir; plays the same part as Citravarman; see under Citravarman.

*Pramodaka*:—A valet in attendance in the bedroom of Candragupta; an agent of Rākṣasa

paid to put an end to Candragupta ; becoming rich suddenly with this payment from Rāksasa's agents, begins to live above his standard and thus rouses Cānakya's suspicion ; is asked by Cānakya how he came by wealth and when he is not able to stand the cross-examination, is put to death by Cānakya by torture.

*Barbaraka* —Candragupta's mahout in charge of the royal she-elephant Candralekhā ; an agent of Rāksasa ; is employed to kill Candragupta while he rides the elephant and enters the palace ; for this purpose he carries a dagger concealed in his golden staff ; regarding how the elephant mistakes him and how the plan miscarries and how he dies, see above under Candralekhā

*Balagupta* .—According to the Drama, a kinsman of royal rank (Svajanagandhi [sambandhi] and Mahūrāja). Mss. of the Drama give his name as Baladevagupta also ; plays the same part as Bhadrabhaṭa ; see below Bhadrabhaṭa

*Bibhatsa* .—He, along with some others is paid by Rāksasa's agents to kill Candragupta while asleep ; they get through an underground passage to Candragupta's bedroom and remain concealed within the wall ; before Candragupta enters the bedroom, Cānakya inspects it and finds ants coming out of holes in the walls with particles of food ; Cānakya concludes that the room is already peopled by some persons in concealment and orders the room to be set on fire ; with smoke enveloping everywhere, Bibhatsa and his associates are not able to find their subterranean passage and perish

*Bhadrabhāṭa* :—A supporter of Candragupta and one who rose to power with him (Pradhāna puruṣa and Sahotthāyin) like Bhāgurāyaṇa; according to the Drama, he is the commander of the elephant corps (Gajādhyakṣa); he along with some others like him, desert Candragupta and resort to Malayaketu through his commander, according to the plan of Cāṇakya; when the trap is well set and Malayaketu himself is made to dismiss Rākṣasa and make himself supportless, he, along with Bhāgurāyaṇa and others bring Malayaketu in bonds to Cāṇakya; in the end, at the instance of Cāṇakya, goes along with Bhāgurāyaṇa and others to Malayaketu's home to crown him there as king.

*Bhāgurāyaṇa* :—Described in the Drama as younger brother of the commander Siṃhabala; friend and ally of Candragupta and Cāṇakya and one of the Pradhānapuruṣas who rose to power along with Candragupta (Sahotthāyins); at Cāṇakya's instance, becomes a confidant of Malayaketu; sends Malayaketu away from Pāṭalipura, telling him that Cāṇakya killed his father to avoid giving him the promised half of the kingdom; joins Malayaketu later and becomes his minister; slowly carries out Cāṇakya's plan to create misunderstanding between Malayaketu and Rākṣasa, makes Malayaketu believe that Rākṣasa is in secret contact with Candragupta and makes Malayaketu abandon Rākṣasa; when Malayaketu is rendered solitary, captures him and brings him over to Cāṇakya; in the end, goes with Bhadrabhāṭa

and others to crown Malayaketu in his own father's kingdom

*Malayaketu* —Son of the Mleccha chief Parvatakeśvara who was the ally of Cānakya and Candragupta, after the death of his father through the Visakanyā, Bhāgurāyana at the instance of Cānakya sends him away to his own country by alarming him that Cānakya murdered his father, according to Cānakya's plan Bhāgurāyana Bhadrabbata etc pretend to have deserted Candragupta and joined him, is taken in by the strategem, makes Bhāgurāyana his minister and allows himself to be misled by him to believe that Rāksasa who had resorted to him for uprooting Candragupta is really a secret agent of Candragupta and is thus made to abandon Rāksasa he is also misled regarding the bonafides of his own five allies Citravarman etc whom he orders to be executed, when he has rendered himself alone in this manner Bhāgurāyana, Bhadrabhata etc bring him bound to Cānakya, to please Rāksasa now Candragupta's minister Cānakya not only spares his life but asks Bhāgurāyana and others to go to Malayaketu's own country and crown him there on his father's throne

Mrs of the Drama read his name variously as Meghākṣa, Meghākhyā, Meghanāda and Medhāṅka

*Maurya* —Son of king Sarvārthasiddhi of Pāṭalipura by his Sūdra wife Murā; half-brother of the Nine Nandas; as he has no chance for the kingdom, he sets the Nine Nandas in mutual discord; is made the commander of the forces, is the father of hundred sons of whom Candragupta is the youngest; the jealous and suspicious Nandas and Rāksasa lock him and his sons in an underground hall by a ruse, leaving young Candragupta to take vengeance on the Nandas, he along with his ninety-nine other sons, perishes in the underground chamber.

*Rāksasa* —Minister of Nanda Sarvārthasiddhi and the Nine Nandas; not well disposed towards Maurya and his sons; after the death of the Nandas and the murder of Sarvārthasiddhi and Parvatakeśvara resorts to Parvatakeśvara first and then his son Malayaketu and works against Cāṇakya and Candragupta; admiring his greatness as a minister, Cāṇakya plans to capture him and make him Candragupta's minister; while Rāksasa's attempts are foiled Cāṇakya's succeed and Rāksasa is made to take the office of minister under Candragupta

*Rājasena* :—According to the Drama, one serving Candragupta from the latter's boyhood days; plays the same part as Bhadrabhata, see above Bhadrabhata

from Candragupta ; when they come back with the jewels Cāṇakya asks them to go to Rākṣasa's camp and sell them to Rākṣasa ; they do so and return.

Cāṇakya's letter mentions these ornaments as sent by Candragupta to Rākṣasa as a token of their mutual regard. Having presented the ornaments given to him by Malayaketu to Siddhārthaka for saving Śakaṭadāsa from Cāṇakya, Rākṣasa appears before Malayaketu with the ornaments of the late Parvatakeśvara bought from Viśvāvasu and his brothers, just after Malayaketu had perused the letter mentioning the ornaments as presented from Candragupta to Rākṣasa ; Malayaketu is unable to believe that Candragupta could have sold such ornaments through any merchants ; the ornaments sold by Viśvāvasu and his brothers to Rākṣasa thus effectively prove to Malayaketu that Rākṣasa is an agent of Candragupta and lead to his abandoning Rākṣasa.

*Viṣakanyā* :— A poison dausel whose contact kills people ; an evil spirit created by Induśarman (Jīvasiddhi, the Jain monk.) at the instance of Rākṣasa to kill Candragupta ; Rākṣasa offers her as a precious gem of a lady to Candragupta ; the vigilant Cāṇakya suggests to Candragupta that Parvatakeśvara deserves to be honoured first as their ally with this precious present ; in the bed chamber, Parvatakeśvara is killed at her contact ; she disappears miraculously ; afraid that he may be caught next morning for sending her, Rākṣasa flies away from the city that very night ; Bhāguryāṇa misleads Malayaketu that it was Cāṇakya

*Rohitaksa* —Some mss of the Drama read Lohitākṣa, according to the drama, the son of the Mālava king, plays the same part as Bhadrabhata, see Bhadrabhata above

*Vijaya* —The name of the Durgapāla, see above Durgapāla

*Vijayaarman* —According to the Drama, chief of a free Kṣatriya republic (Kṣatragana) community plays the same part as Bhadrabhata, see Bhadrabhata above

*Virudhagupta* —A spy of Rākṣasa who brings to the latter the news at Pātālipura from the seige of the city upto the leading of Śakata dāsa to the gallows the news of the mis-carriage of the attempts of Dāruvarman, of the failure of those of Abhayadatta, Pramodaka and Bibhatsa, of the banishment of Jivasiddhi, of the condemnation of Śakatadāsa to the gallows and the imprisonment of Candanadāsa

*Viśvūvasu* —a Brahman friend of Cānakya; when Cīnalaya gets Rākṣasa's signet ring through his spy Nipunaka he thinks of some means to capture Rākṣasa with his own ring, just at that time, Candragupta sends word that he likes to perform the obsequies of the late ally Parvatakeśvara and distribute Parvatakeśvara's ornaments to Brāhmins, this puts the idea into Cānakya's mind that the late Parvatakeśvara's jewels can be used to involve Rākṣasa in trouble and to capture him, Cānakya sends Viśvūvasu and two brothers of his go to and receive the jewel presents

from Candragupta ; when they come back with the jewels Cāṇakya asks them to go to Rākṣasa's camp and sell them to Rākṣasa ; they do so and return.

Cāṇakya's letter mentions these ornaments as sent by Candragupta to Rākṣasa as a token of their mutual regard. Having presented the ornaments given to him by Malayaketu to Siddhārthaka for saving Śakaṭadāsa from Cāṇakya, Rākṣasa appears before Malayaketu with the ornaments of the late Parvatakeśvara bought from Viśvāvasu and his brothers, just after Malayaketu had perused the letter mentioning the ornaments as presents from Candragupta to Rākṣasa ; Malayaketu is unable to believe that Candragupta could have sold such ornaments through any merchants ; the ornaments sold by Viśvāvasu and his brothers to Rākṣasa thus effectively prove to Malayaketu that Rākṣasa is an agent of Candragupta and lead to his abandoning Rākṣasa.

*Viṣakanyā* :— A poison damsel whose contact kills people ; an evil spirit created by Induśarman (Jīvasiddhi, the Jain monk) at the instance of Rākṣasa to kill Candragupta ; Rākṣasa offers her as a precious gem of a lady to Candragupta ; the vigilant Cāṇakya suggests to Candragupta that Parvatakeśvara deserves to be honoured first as their ally with this precious present ; in the bed chamber, Parvatakeśvara is killed at her contact ; she disappears miraculously ; afraid that he may be caught next morning for sending her, Rākṣasa flies away from the city that very night ; Bhāgurāyaṇa misleads Malayaketu that it was Cāṇakya



who used the Visakanyā against Parvatakeśvara and makes him run away to his country; later, Jīvasiddhi (Induśarman) reveals, at a psychological moment, to Malayaketu himself that Rākṣasa it was who sent the Viśakanyā.

*Viṣṇudāsa*.—A leading merchant of Pāṭalīpura and friend of Candanadāsa, who it is said, offers money for the release of Candanadāsa, and on being unable to save him, goes away to immolate himself in fire; a spy of Cāṇakya tries to hang himself in the old garden in the outskirts of Pāṭalīpura before Rākṣasa's eyes and when asked by Rākṣasa why he is hanging himself, tells Rākṣasa that as a friend of Viṣṇudāsa the friend of Candanadāsa, he is unable to bear the loss of his friend and is hence committing suicide; this news makes Rākṣasa run to the execution ground to save Candanadāsa by offering himself as the victim.

*Vairodhaka*.—Brother of Parvatakeśvara; after the killing of Parvatakeśvara with the Viśakanyā, while Malayaketu runs away, Vairodhaka is consoled by Cāṇakya with the promise of half the kingdom originally promised to Parvatakeśvara; secretly Cāṇakya is considering the way to dispose him off when Cāṇakya smells danger from the architectural erections of Dāruvarman, made ready for Candragupta's entry into the palace. Cāṇakya seats Vairodhaka on the throne, divides the kingdom, and makes him enter the palace on Candragupta's elephant and with Candragupta's retinue, so that Dāruvarman and his

associates may take him to be Candragupta himself, though the arch does not fall on him and kill him, Dāruvarman kills him with an iron piece drawn from the gateway

Mss of the Drama read his name as Vairocaka also

*Śa<sup>1</sup>atadasa* — A Kāyastha or Scribe of Pāṭali-pura, a great friend of Rāksasa, ill disposed towards Candragupta and Cānakya, left by Rāksasa within the city with funds to carry on anti-Candragupta activities, Cānakya makes a spy of his cultivate his friendship and get an unaddressed and unsigned letter written by him which is ultimately used against Rāksasa to show Rāksasa as being in secret pact with Candragupta, with his family thrown in prison, is condemned to the stakes for his treacherous activities and is spirited away from the stakes to Rāksasa's camp by Siddhārthaka according to a plan of Cānakya, entrusted by Rāksasa with the charge of his seal

*Śikharaka* — (or Sikharasena or Sekharasena) Mss of the Drama read his name variously thus, Mahādeva's text itself records it as Sikharaka on p 24 and as Śikharasena on p 28, is the Commander of Malayaketu, Bhadrabhatta and others who desert Candragupta and resort to Malayaketu introduce themselves to Malayaketu through him, saying that having left Candragupta for his association with an evil minister, they approach him there not through Rāksasa, but through his commander, Malayaketu does not understand what they mean and when he asks Bhāgurāyana, he

gives the misleading answer that if unable to bear Cānakya, Candragupta dismisses his minister, Rāksasa may come to terms with Candragupta as the latter is a member of the Nanda family and all the anger of Rāksasa is only against Cānakya and if it happens so, Malayaketu may not trust Bhadrabhata and others too were they to resort to him through Rāksasa. When Malayaketu has been misled to believe that his five associates Citravarman etc are also his enemies he orders Śikharasena according to the drama to put them all to death.

*Samrddhārthaka* —A spy of Cānakya, along with Siddhārthaka puts on the guise of a Candāla and takes Candanadāsa for execution.

Mss of the Drama read his name as Samiddhārthaka and Susiddhārthaka also.

*Sarvartnasiddhi* —Nanda king of Pāṭalipura, has two wives Sunandā and Murā, father of the Nine Nandas and Maurya and grandfather of Candragupta, retired to the forest for penance after the fall of Pāṭalipura and the death of his sons the Nine Nandas. Cānakya has him murdered in the forest so that Rāksasa may have no member of the royal family to take up as his support.

*Simhanūda* —King of Malaya, plays the same part as Citravarman, see above Citravarman.

Mss of the Drama read his name is Nṛsimha also.

*Siddhārthaka* —An agent of Cānakya who makes himself the friend of Sakatadāsa the scribe

and friend of Raksasa, gets the unaddressed, unsigned letter written by Sakatadāsa, at the instance of Cānākya according to Cānākya's plan; takes the fake letter sealed with Rāksasa's ring and the ring also, arranges with the executioners his rescue of Śakatadāsa from the stakes, along with Sakatadāsa, presents himself to Rāksasa as Sakatadāsa's saviour, is presented by Rāksasa with the ornaments on his body, the ornaments which Malayaketu had just presented to Rāksasa; ties up the ornaments and seals them with Rāksasa's ring, hands over to Rāksasa his Ring as found at the door of Candanadāsa's house, with Raksasa's permission serves him, when the forces of Malayaketu and Rāksasa are near Pātalipura, he tries to leave the camp without the seal-permit, manages to get himself thus caught and examined by Bhāgurayana chief agent of Cānākya at the camp of Malayaketu, allows himself to be beat and tells that he is carrying a letter and some presents from Rāksasa to Candragupta, and thus involves Rāksasa in trouble, Malayaketu's suspicion that Rāksasa is in conspiracy with Candragupta is fully substantiated by this returns to Pātalipura, and along with Samuddhārthaka, puts on the guise of Candālas and enacts the part of the executioner of Candanadāsa, and when Rāksasa offers himself in the place of Candanadāsa and asks the information to be carried to Cānākya, informs Cānākya that Rāksasa has been brought

*Sindhusena* — King of the Sindhus, plays the same part as Citravarmān, see Citravarmān above

Ms of the Drama read his name as Susena also

*Sunanda* —Kshatriya wife of king Sarvārtha-siddhi of Pātalipura, when a sage's Pādodaka is sprinkled on her she does not receive it with as much reverence as Murā hence her nine sons are first delivered as a mass of flesh mother of the Nava Nandas

*Stanakalāśa* —A royal bard in the palace at Pātalipura, in the pay of Rāksasa when Cānakya and Candragupta enact their feigned quarrel he recites verses fanning the feelings of Candragupta

---

Concordance of Prose passages  
taken by Mahādeva from Viśākhadatta

Mahādeva's Text.

Mudrārākṣasa,  
Telang's Edn.

Pages.

Pages.

16	
17	127-8, 130
18	130-3
	134-67
19	67-8
	81-2
20	82-3
	87
21	88-89
22	103
23	144-142
24	142
25-7	165-179
29	229-232
30	234 236-8
31	241
32-4	243-247-259

The above table shows only the longer passages reproduced by Mahādeva from the Drama and not the many small passages, phrases and words reproduced by him.

---